

tion with him without being impressed with the idea that there were few men in the Empire better fitted for the position for which he had been selected.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Lord Herschell was a strong Liberal, a man who has taken a very prominent part politically as a Gladstonian, who was in Gladstone's government, a Home Ruler, and had the most advanced ideas in English politics, yet a strong Conservative Premier like Lord Salisbury disregarded the opinions which he held upon English politics, and appointed him to a position which he knew, from personal intercourse and association with him as a public man, he would fill not only with dignity to himself but with benefit to his country. I do not know of anything that has occurred for a long time which could affect those who knew the gentleman so much as to read of his sudden death. I was deeply impressed when I read a short paragraph from what is said to be the last speech he made, or one of the last remarks he made, which was that it was too bad, that he should have "spent six months in negotiation and to have it result in nothing more than a broken leg." Afterwards, of course, his life was sacrificed in the interests of his country.

The next paragraph refers to the plebiscite. If hon. gentlemen will look back at the debates in this House, as well as the debates in the House of Commons, they will see that it was predicted that the result would be nothing more than the expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars, and such has been the result. Whether those who are termed temperance people, or the prohibitionists whom my hon. friend I know to a certain extent represents, are as pleased as he says they are at the result, remains to be seen—no, it does not remain to be seen in the future; all you have to do is to listen to the utterances of these gentlemen and read the letters which they write to the press, to be convinced of this fact, that my hon. friend has misjudged them, that in his desire to defend the "best government," as he terms it, that ever existed in this country, he has forgotten the utterances of the secretary of the Alliance, and the letters which have been written from different parts of the country. I would commend, not

only for his perusal, but for his serious attention a letter which has just been printed, a manifesto which was printed and circulated in the province of Quebec by Major Bond, the son of Bishop Bond, in which he points out the cruelty of attributing to the Premier of this country, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, of whom he has been a very great admirer and is yet, as far as I know to-day, unless he has changed his opinion on the subject of prohibition, as evidently my hon. friend opposite has, in which he says it was a cruelty to attribute to him the position of having attempted to humbug the people by submitting the question of prohibition to them, without the slightest intention of ever putting the will of the people, as expressed through the ballot box, upon the statute-book. His language is very strong, and he quotes from the speeches delivered by the Premier on this question to show that he could not, in honesty or in fairness to the people, do other than carry out the will of the majority of the people. The secretary of the Alliance in Toronto has expressed a similar opinion on this question, and he combats the position taken by the Premier in this way: he says if a certain percentage of the votes is to control your action in a question of this kind, why do you not apply the same principle to yourselves, who represent but a minority and a small minority of the whole electorate of the Dominion? I observe the Minister of Justice smiles. He thinks it absurd to ask him to give up his position, I know, because he represents a majority of those elected; but if the non-voters upon the prohibition question are to be considered as opposed to the principle, then logically the non-voters and those who voted against the late government, being in the large majority, would place them in a minority, and under our system of government the majority is supposed to rule. It is the essence of responsible government that we should be governed by the majority. It might not be uninteresting, if it were not so long, to read a letter which has just appeared in the public press—perhaps my hon. friend has not read it.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Perhaps my hon. friend would not object to my asking whether he concurs in that line of argument?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—When I am placed in the position of my