

THEN AND NOW

The inconsistent attitude of the Liberals shown by statements made when in power and since their defeat.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley's statements of 1911 compared with those of to-day.

MR. PUGSLEY IN 1911.

On July 24, 1911, Hon. William Pugsley, Laurier's Minister of Public Works, made the following statement:

"The threats which honourable gentlemen have made this afternoon, tend towards almost, if not quite, revolutionizing the theory which has hitherto prevailed. That theory has been that gentlemen would recognize not only their right but their duty and that is that **THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY SHALL PREVAIL**. That is recognized throughout this country as governing all assemblies, all meetings in which people are concerned, and at any meeting attended by the people of this country, whenever there has been fair and reasonable opportunity for the discussion of any question, **THE MINORITY HAVE ALWAYS RECOGNIZED THAT THE VIEW OF THE MAJORITY SHALL PREVAIL**, so far at all events as that body is concerned; and so in this Parliament. I ask is it not tending to destroy free parliamentary institutions for honourable gentlemen to rise, as they have risen to-day and threaten that this question shall not be allowed to come to a vote."

"I do not care what took place in 1896; I was not here in 1896. I SAY IT IS NOT IN HARMONY WITH THE PRINCIPLES WHICH OUGHT TO GOVERN PARLIAMENT ANY INSTITUTIONS THAT GENTLEMEN SHOULD RISE IN THEIR PLACES AND THREATEN, SIMPLY BECAUSE THEIR VIEWS ARE NOT THE VIEWS OF THE MAJORITY THAT THERE SHALL BE NO OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE UPON THIS QUESTION, and no opportunity, in a constitutional way, of giving expression to the views of the majority of this House. THAT IS REVOLUTIONARY; IT IS NOT IN HARMONY WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT."

MR. PUGSLEY IN 1913.

The same Pugsley, now an aspirant to lead the Liberal Opposition, makes the following statement to-day:

"Let me say, Sir, that in the interests of the people of this country and in the interests of the minority, it would be better to apply the dagger than to strangle free speech. If this resolution should pass and we have an attempt made to apply the guillotine, I do not know that the guillotine is any more agreeable than the dagger."

And he also says:

"I object to the resolution because the rules which have prevailed for centuries have been established for the purpose of protecting the rights of the minorities and ensuring the priceless liberty of free speech in Parliament; I am opposed to it, Sir, because I believe this is an attempt to place the minority of this House absolutely under the control of the majority."