

that the claims of the Minister of Public Works as to his influence in Quebec are sound, that he can ring his bell and get the people to follow him as sheep follow a bell-wether. Then we may believe that the French Liberals who are devoted to prohibition went and voted against prohibition on political grounds, and if that was the case, the vote cast in Quebec must be considered a strong one in favour of prohibition. We come then to the 16th September, when prohibition is denounced as utopian. On the 24th September we have an article on the plebiscite, in which the writer urges the people not to lose sight of what a fiasco prohibition has been in Maine, Rhode Island, Vermont, Massachusetts and Kansas, and in every part of Canada where it has been tried, and urges them not to vote for it. The first article in the issue of September 26th is in the same tone, and on the 27th we have an article headed "The Plebiscite," also against prohibition. Then, we have an article in which the writer refers to the Minister of Agriculture as only representing one in the Cabinet on this question. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) quoted the Minister of Agriculture as saying he was not alone in the Cabinet in his views on this question, when he was wooing the votes, politically, of the people of Quebec. Here we have the Minister of Agriculture quoted in this paper as saying he is the only one, and this is held up as we know it was elsewhere, to show that this was not a question in which any member of the Government took an interest except the Minister of Agriculture. Not only that, but the hon. Minister of Public Works made a speech—I cannot lay my hand on it at the moment—in which he declared that the plebiscite was never a plank in the platform adopted by the conference in Ottawa.

Mr. DUGAS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Dugas) is from Quebec and knows that such a speech was delivered—it was notorious at the time. The way the Minister proved that this was not a plank of the conference at Ottawa was by saying that a large number of the people had gone away from the conference before that was brought before them. I was not at the conference, but this does not appear on the face of these proceedings, nor was it ever made to appear when these hon. gentlemen were seeking the votes of the electors. I have here a campaign sheet issued one or two years afterwards by a gentleman who is exercising great influence of a certain kind in the ranks of the Liberal party at the present time. It is headed "Dominion of Canada. Principles, policy and platform of the Liberal party," and it bears the name "Alexander Smith, secretary, Ontario Liberal Association, 34 Victoria Street, Toronto," and is dated January, 1895. The address to the reader at the beginning says, "This

Mr. DAVIN.

pamphlet is not for general distribution." Why not for general distribution? Because anybody who reads it will see that it was intended, not to meet the eye of those who could criticise it with knowledge of all the facts connected with the Liberal party. On page 5 of this pamphlet, after mentioning a number of questions said to be advocated by the Liberal party, we have this paragraph:

There are a number of other questions, such as temperance, the superannuation of public officers, the abolition of Government House, &c., on which the Liberal party has ranked itself in opposition to certain lines pursued by Conservatives.

What does that mean? That means nothing else but this—that the Liberal party had gone further than to say: We want a plebiscite. You know very well, Mr. Speaker, with your knowledge of politics, how that would strike the ear of any prohibitionist in Ontario or the west—the Liberal party has always ranked itself, on a question of temperance, against Conservatives, not on the plebiscite only, but for prohibition. That it was intended to deceive is palpable, because the abolition of Government House was never a plank in the Liberal platform. As the plebiscite was intended to catch prohibitionists, this abolition of the Government House was intended to catch the Patrons. Now, why do I speak thus?

Mr. McMULLEN. You can answer that.

Mr. DAVIN. What a ghoul that is waking up from his crass dreams of stupidity! what a wretched moral ghoul the member for North Wellington is, making a remark like that, meaningless, having nothing to it, coming out of the malignant recesses of a heart that has never been able to learn humanity, as long as he has lived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will withdraw the expression "stupidity."

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, well, I will withdraw it, and I will say the brilliant lights of intellect gleam upon that brow of his perpetually. Now, Mr. Speaker, why do I speak thus? I say the time has come when we have a Government that takes \$250,000 to get from the people of Canada their judgment on a certain question. They get that judgment, and they were bound to take legislative action; they were bound, above all, not to take the course they are taking here tonight, trying to dodge it as much as they can. We had an argument addressed to the ex-Minister of Finance from an hon. gentleman opposite, in which he quoted what the ex-Minister of Finance said long ago, that it would require a large majority in favour of prohibition to warrant prohibition being enacted. But that argument will not help the Government. I remember well, when this vote for \$250,000 was being taken, the ex-Minister of Finance and others appealed