

argument following the repudiation of the platform is only surpassed by the hypocrisy of the party pledge preceding it. The truth is, the party have been playing the game of government as a species of state swindling—a conjuring feat on a large scale, and the Conservative party can say to men like myself, who worked for the Liberal party at the last election, and went up and down the province for months assailing the Conservative party because of the royal commission, “What a joke they have played on those idiots.” Yes, they have; but I have to remind the men composing the rank and file of the Liberal party in Canada, that there is a scene in Homer where Nemesis appears behind Thersites national politics with such violations of principle as this is not politics at all—not even the depraved politics of the violent partisan, but a herd of provinces, through their representatives, hunting together for their food.

IN A POLITICAL CUL DE SAC.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has led his party into a place of annihilation, and made that terrible choice a political battlefield without an outlet. To-day 2,000 pulpits, 5,000 societies, 100,000 voters are busy denouncing the government and the supporters for this base betrayal, while the religious and independent press are sounding the tocsin of a free democracy from one end of Canada to another. Who is to stem this tide; whose voice will the people hear? Can any one say anything for them, that the death roll will not appear through the whitewash? Never was Sedan more certainly a mortar into which the German army went pounding, than will be the ballot-box a retort for the destruction of the Liberal party. If I knew the day in June, 1893, that the plebiscite was adopted into their platform, and the day that the Dominion elections will be held, I should be able to show that that which was knitted together on those two days came apart the day of the election, that the party which began at the convention under the black flag of a lie, ended at the ballot box under the white flag of disgrace, that the monstrous fabrication of the convention burst asunder the day of election.

Nothing that the Liberal party can do will from this day forward to election day divert public attention, not if they created for us a fresh Klondike every month, if they made every citizen as wise as Solomon, blameless as St. John and safe as an angel in the courts of heaven; to vote for such a government would still be a damnable crime, while its lever of power was the liquor traffic. It is too late to deliberate; the gauntlet is thrown down; we must take it up, as the Wesleyan says to-day “through the hundred and twenty constituencies in Canada giving majorities.” This letter of the Premier is an infamous and insolent challenge to the democracy of this country, and it is true that for a time it kills us; but happily such deaths as these, like the deaths of the gods, are only for a time. When we are able, through county conventions, held in every county in Canada, by public meetings held in every center of population and school-house in the land, articles in every paper and sermons and speeches from every pulpit and platform, to rouse this country as it never was before, then our masters at Ottawa will begin to see rising in the gloom behind them the enormous head of the people. Let us get ready for 1900 by giving the world an exhibition of a country “where the citizen is always the head and ideal, where outside authority enters always after the precedence of inside authority, where the populace rises at once against the never ending audacity and insolence of elected persons.” My only object in writing this letter is to rally into one unique thought the courage of the country. On the body of Charpentier, who perished at the barricade at the Petit Carreau, in Paris, was found a note book with a single line. “Admonet et magna testatur voce per umbras.” In that spirit I write this letter. J. T. BULMER, Halifax, March 15th.

I read this more particularly to show how incorrect my hon. friend is in stating that the temperance people and prohibitionists are highly delighted with what the government has done.

This letter is a very good indication of the feeling of those who, as I believe, were betrayed by the government whose sole object was to evade and get rid for a time of a troublesome question. I might elaborate on this question for an hour. I have extracts from the speeches of the Minister of Agriculture and a number of extracts from the speeches of the Premier himself, in which he indicated, in the plainest possible manner, that if a majority of the people were in favour of prohibition, his party would carry out the pledge which they had given, and introduce a bill to enforce prohibition. He did not say, I frankly admit, a majority of the votes cast; he said a majority of the people, but when we use that expression in the working of our institutions and in our mode of government, it means a majority of those who cast their votes at the poles.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice shakes his head. I know that he is to a certain extent a theorist—I know, more than that, that he is a good constitutional thinker, and he knows, and every man within the sound of my voice knows, that when we go to an election of any kind, whether it be municipal or of a grave political character, affecting the whole country, the majority of the votes cast are those which are supposed—I will not say supposed—that the majority of the people rule and control the future action of the government or the municipality which has to deal with the question. If such were not the case, what would you do in the case of an election of a member of Parliament where there are hundreds on the poll books who never poll their votes; and where some, as I know, in the House of Commons sit with a majority of two or three, and yet have all the advantages of a member who has a thousand majority, and are recognized there as legitimate and proper representatives of the people, just as much as if each of them had been elected by acclamation on the supposition that every man in his constituency was in favour of his election. In the present case every province, but one, has pronounced by a large majority in favour of the principle of prohibition. I am not going into the reasons which led the people of the province of Quebec, who evidently hold