

Orthology Photography Fiction Fishing
Christianity Art Cooking Essays
Buddhism Freemasonry Medicine Biology
Music Ancient Egypt Evolution
Carpentry Physics Dance Geology
Mathematics Fitness Shakespeare
Finance Yoga Marketing Confidence
Immortality Biographies Poetry
Psychology Witchcraft Electronics
Chemistry History Law Accounting
Philosophy Anthropology Alchemy Drama
Quantum Mechanics Atheism Sexuality
Mental Health Ancient History Crime
Entrepreneurship Leadership Sport
Paleontology Neuroscience Islam
Metaphysics Investment Archaeology

Forgotten Books

— www.forgottenbooks.com —

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

DAMON ^{AND} PYTHIAS



A DRAMA

OF

UEBEC LIBERALISM

BY

JOHN UNDERHILL.

1891



DAMON AND PYTHIAS

A DRAMA

OF

QUEBEC LIBERALISM

BY

JOHN UNDERHILL.

1891

166183
17/10/2

DAMON AND PYTHIAS.

A DRAMA OF QUEBEC LIBERALISM

—BY—

JOHN UNDERHILL.

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

DAMON	-	-	-	-	-	<i>Hon. Count Mercier.</i>
PYTHIAS		-	-	-	-	<i>Hon. Wilfrid Laurier.</i>
VALET	-	-	-	-	-	<i>Ernest Pacaud.</i>

SCENES—in *Quebec Legislature and Ottawa House of Commons.*

THEATRE—*situated in the City of Montreal.*

“It is easier not to give a man the means of having influence than to prevent his abuse of it.”—MADAME ROLAND.

PROLOGUE.

For a long time, in the eyes of the people, Mr. Mercier and Mr. Laurier passed current as disinterested and “very honorable men.” We find that “for pure love of country” the Provincial Premier is about to step into the arena of Dominion politics, and the leader of the Dominion Opposition is to accept his services—of course for some patriotic consideration. It will be necessary to firstly discover what that consideration is, and what Mr. Laurier could

or would give Mr. Mercier for the latter's interference. If Mr. Mercier's motives for uniting with Mr. Laurier are to secure money from the Dominion for the payment of his debts and those of his confederates, most assuredly we must conclude that he, at least, is not "an honorable man." We must learn how far Mr. Mercier sought to trade upon Mr. Laurier's fair name, and how far Mr. Laurier was willing to lend that name as a cloak to hide the deformity of Mr. Mercier's motives. Then we must discover whether Mr. Laurier is really "an honorable man," or whether he is not a more accomplished hypocrite than Mr. Mercier; but one playing his game in another sphere. Finally the catastrophe of this little drama must be the unmasking of Mr. Laurier. There is a subordinate character, the Valet—Mr. E. Pacaud,—who is like the hyphen of flesh connecting the Siamese twins of Canadian Liberalism. He is the villain of the play, possessing the entire confidence of his two masters. In order to make our characters speak—and condemn themselves in their own words—we will quote from their own special organs, their own editorials, their own letters, telegrams, interviews and speeches. Very little comment will be required. We will commence in 1887, when Mr. Mercier came into power, when Mr. Laurier became a leader, and follow them down to August, 1891.

One more word of preface, and then let us dash into "the midst of things." *L'Electeur* of Quebec is Mr. Laurier's Quebec organ, Mr. Mercier's especially adopted mouth-piece, and Mr. Pacaud's own paper, of which he is editor and director. *La Patrie* of Montreal is the acknowledged French-Canadian organ of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec. *The Herald* is the accepted English organ of the same party in Lower Canada. Once for all, our quotations shall be from one or the other of these newspapers, so that the reader may accept as entirely orthodox Liberalism what follows—whenever it is between quotation marks.

ACT I. 1887.

It will be remembered that as soon as Mr. Mercier got into power he conceived the idea of an Interprovincial Conference, which had for object the "raising of the wind" to swell the sails of his bark as he mounted the political waves and steered for the port of Fortune. Mr. Laurier accepted these resolutions, and agreed to put them into force should he ever get into power in the Dominion. It was, therefore, to Mr. Mercier's interest and that of his pocket, and the pockets of his hangers-on, to see that no stone was left unturned to lift Mr. Laurier into power.

L'Electeur, 19th March, 1887.—"The way to readjust the provincial subsidies, and to decree that in future that way can no longer be changed for the benefit of one province to the detriment of the others, is one of the objects of the Interprovincial Conference, and we must admit it is a worthy one."

Mark the following :

L'Electeur, 10th November, 1887.—"Of the specific allotment announced in the Act of 1867, the increase for the Province of Quebec would be \$140,000 per year, according to the basis originally proposed to the conference, and the one definitively accepted for Ontario, but our Government insisted that we should obtain annually \$10,000 more, giving as its reason the necessity in which we find ourselves of printing our public documents in both languages. That demand was granted, so that instead of receiving, like Ontario, three times the amount originally fixed by the Federal Act—that is to say, three times \$10,000 or \$210,000, augmentation of \$140,000—we shall receive \$220,000, or an augmentation of \$150,000 per year."

As we shall see, this clause of the resolutions alone would furnish enough from the Dominion treasury to pay Pacaud his salary and to give Mercier a yearly trip to France. But we will reserve comment, and let these gentlemen themselves tell the effects of these resolutions and how they knit odd bed-fellows together.

L'Electeur, 27th July, 1887.—"Mr. Boivin, secretary to the Prime Minister, wrote Messrs. Doucet and Ouellette, the secretaries of the reception committee, that Mr. Mercier desired to be

present at Somerset on the 2nd August, to assist at the grand demonstration in honor of Mr. Laurier."

L'Electeur, 3rd August, 1887.—"Messrs. Laurier and Mercier received a glorious ovation. . . . As soon as Mr. Laurier ceased speaking, Mr. Mercier was presented with an address of welcome, in reply to which he delivered one of those vigorous harangues, the secret of which he knows so well."

L'Electeur, 4th August, 1887 :—Report of Mr. Laurier's speech; he said that "He formulated the hope that the Interprovincial Conference, organized by Mr. Mercier, would contribute enormously to put an end to different provincial misfortunes."

The address presented to Mr. Laurier is signed by Mr. Ernest Pacaud *en tête*.

L'Electeur, 5th August, 1887.—Report of Mr. Laurier's speech continued: "I go farther," said Mr. Laurier, "I hesitate not to say that I am an admirer of the constitution. Doubtless, it is not perfect; it contains important faults, which my friend, Mr. Mercier, shall be called upon to correct very soon, in his Interprovincial Conference."

L'Electeur, 6th August, 1887.—The same report continued: "However," said Mr. Laurier, "there is a question on which the conference will have to pronounce; it is the question of provincial subsidies. *On that question I think I agree, as, moreover, I always entirely agree with Mr. Mercier on whatever course he takes.*"

L'Electeur, 8th August, 1887.—Report of Mr. Mercier's speech at Somerset, 2nd August, 1887: "When we saw Mr. Blake disappear, we saluted with pleasure the election of our friend Mr. Laurier to that high post of confidence. It is not for me to here pronounce his panygeric—it is in every mouth—but, gentlemen, they who heard the magnificent speech that he has just made, they who could understand his elevation of thought, the loftiness of his views, the spirit of justice that animates him, the vast scope of his declarations, they should be satisfied and assured that Hon. Wilfred Laurier is in a position to direct with a steady hand the destinies of *our* cause at Ottawa."

"The Province of Quebec does not want to be treated differently from the other provinces, but she wants to be treated with the same justice." "Hon. Mr. Laurier was good enough to refer to my project of an Inter-provincial conference, which I am in a position to announce will open during the first fifteen days of next September in the capital of the Province of Quebec. The object of that conference is to find remedies for the present evils, and to devise a way to conserve that federal system which Mr. Laurier says is so good, and in which, *as in all, I agree with him.*"

L'Electeur, 16th September, 1887.—“Hon. Mr. Mercier does not count upon corruption to govern. He wishes to strike the mind and the heart of the people by the development of his political work. Public gratitude will do the rest.”

O ! Tempora ! O ! Mores ! How the spirit of his dream has since changed !

L'Electeur, 7th October, 1887.—“Mr. Laurier's opponents finding him invulnerable, attack Mr. Mercier and hold Mr. Laurier responsible for the acts of Quebec's first Minister.”

They are doing so, and with greater reason to-day. Follow our chain, the links will lead us to the staple before long.

L'Electeur, 8th November, 1887.—Mr. Mercier's grand reception at the Club Letellier, Montreal. After his speech, Mr. Laurier rose and said: “For twenty years I have known Mr. Mercier, and my admiration for him is as great to-day as it has ever been since I first knew him. I need not pronounce his eulogy, but I must say that he made one omission in his speech, for he spoke about everything but Mr. Mercier himself. I say frankly and without any reserve that Mr. Mercier is the greatest Canadian we have had since the days of Papineau.” “Had the Mercier Government done nothing other than to have convoked the Interprovincial Conference, that should suffice to render it worthy of the confidence and admiration of the public. Mr. Mercier stated that it was not for him to say what reasons Sir John had for not accepting the invitation extended to his Government. But I know them. It is because he felt that a most terrible blow was about to fall upon his insidious and centralizing government.”

This is the same Mr. Laurier who called a confederate and centralizing system *so good*, and with whom Mr. Mercier agreed on that point, *as upon all others*.

Before dropping the curtain on 1887, it would be well to remark that while the Interprovincial Conference was in full blast Mr. Erastus Wiman came to Quebec at Mr. Mercier's invitation (instigated by Mr. Laurier), and delivered his first lecture upon Commercial Union in the skating rink of that city. The night of the 26th October saw the members of the Interprovincial Conference

betaking themselves to the skating rink and there imbibing the first lessons that the future Unrestricted Reciprocity man taught to Canadians. A small annexationist group in anticipation! It was very opportune that Mr. Wiman should preach the possibility of realizing Mr. Laurier's boyhood dream of ultimate American union, and that Mr. Mercier should have such a distinguished audience assembled to hear him. But, perhaps, Mr. Laurier will say that he knew nothing of all this!

Well, the Conference took place—passed its resolutions, and Mr. Mercier saw visions of the Laurier Government paying off his debts and securing the credit of the province to a degree that he might be enabled to borrow upon the European markets. But these were "Castles in the air." To-day Mr. Laurier would like to rise out of Mercier and Pacaud; but his wings are clipped. He would like the country to believe that he has had no intimate connection with these men and that he has not been privy to all their actions. Let his own words and actions refute him.

ACT II—1889-1890.

The following letter is addressed to Mr. Pacaud, the editor of the Mercier-Laurier organ. It comes from Mr. Laurier's home; if not penned by himself it has been inspired by him. It is only too obvious that the writer seeks therein to hide his identity; but that identity presses out from behind the curtain when he tries to fold it too tightly around him. He opens the letter by addressing Pacaud in the second person; then he supposes himself answering one of Pacaud's enemies, and he speaks of Pacaud in the third person (which gives him the chance of using the name of Laurier)—then he falls back into the original style and speaks to him again in the second person. The letter is cleverly written. We will take a few extracts to show Laurier's great friendship for and faith in Pacaud,

to show Pacaud's standing even two years ago, in the estimation of the public and to cast a little light upon the importance of this valet-de-chambre to the two great leaders in the Liberal army :

L'Electeur, 28th October, 1889 :

“ ARTHABASKAVILLE, 13th Oct., 1889.

My Dear Friend,—I read every day in the Opposition papers, which come into my hands, so many infamous things about you that I am overcome with vexation. I really do not understand how you can steer your way so calmly through so many troubles. Your paper does not take up the hundredth part of the perfidies that your enemies shower upon you. . . . *L'Electeur* is not the question—it is a question of party. But it is precisely for that reason you should refrain from falling, through an irrational silence, into indifferentism; not so much on account of yourself as on account of the cause *we* are defending together.

. . . . I have, myself, long hesitated to take up my pen, but I see with sorrow that calumnies, by dint of repetitions, are making their way even into our own ranks; yes, even amongst our own friends there are some who will wind up by believing ill of you. . . . By constantly seeing the name of Pacaud, of *L'Electeur*, running the gauntlet of *La Minerve*, *Le Monde* and *La Presse*, stuck to every species of compromising account, by dint of hearing all kinds of crazy stories about your extravagant way of living in Quebec, of your intimacies with the ministers, of the increasing prosperity of your paper, by dint of hearing your name dragged into all public discussions, and your case unfolded in every county, one should not be surprised that bad reports about you find so many echoes.”

Here the writer speaks of Pacaud in the third person, for the purpose of being able to bring in the name *Laurier* without attracting suspicion.

“ He was twice a candidate at his own expense—(that is Pacaud). He edited three papers that rendered immense services—*Le Journal*, of Arthabaska; *La Concorde*, of Three Rivers, and *L'Electeur*, of Quebec. He founded the first with Mr. Laurier, paid for it out of their own pockets, filled it with his writings, and scattered it *gratis* amongst his friends. It was a paper that was born in sacrifice and lived in struggle.”

Now the writer changes back to the original way of addressing him in the second person.

“ You were wrong, my dear friend; the party might have lost its only organ in Quebec district had you accepted a better place, but, at least, to-day you would not be insulted, nor called a parasite, a pawn-broker, a boodler, etc. But since you have otherwise regulated your course of life, and have not ceased to consecrate it to *our* cause, pay no attention to such outcries; walk with head erect past the men who are jealous of the position you hold to-day, but who never dreamed of envying you the sacrifices of fortune and time it cost you. Continue your work; perhaps our people are on the eve of finding out that they have much to learn in the line of gratitude from other races.”—*Un Ancien*—or it should be *W. Laurier*.

So much for Pacaud, his past record and his early and continued association with Mr. Laurier. Let us turn to what his own organ has to say from time to time!

L'Electeur, 9th May, 1889.—Interview with Mr. Laurier. He says: “ Mr. Mercier has made an alliance in order to get into power. Now that he is there he must keep it.”

So there was really some species of agreement, and Mr. Mercier having obtained portion of what he wanted, namely, the getting into power, should fulfil his part of the contract, which must have been to help Laurier into the Premiership. Of course these are but the preliminary steps necessary to attain the real objects in view, namely, Laurier to furnish money for Quebec, and Quebec to return the compliment by securing means to contest Dominion Conservative elections in case Mr. Laurier missed his leap towards the Treasury benches. A neat little programme and well followed out.

L'Electeur, 5th January, 1889.—“ To work citizens! Maybe what we are going to add will stimulate the zeal of our citizens. Whilst we were penning this article we received the following despatches ”:—

So Pacaud is the *we* who pens the article.

“ ARTHABASKAVILLE, 4th January, 1889:

“ *Ernest Pacaud, Esq., Quebec* :

“ Put my name on the list for five shares in the new hotel.

“ W. LAURIER.”

“MONTREAL, 5th January.

“*Ernest Pacaud, Quebec :*

“I wish success to the Grand Hotel project, for which I subscribe some shares.

“HONORÉ MERCIER.”

As in all other monetary undertakings, wherein Laurier and Mercier seem to have had any interest, so in this one, Pacaud was the medium. Of course, no person should for a moment suspect Mr. Laurier—the great man of purity—of having any knowledge of Pacaud’s character or his actions. No matter whether they were companions from school days, Mr. Laurier must for the moment be supposed ignorant of all Mr. Mercier’s and Mr. Pacaud’s designs.

La Patrie, 13th June, 1890.—“If Mr. Mercier and his friends are at the helm of affairs since 1887, it is to the strong Liberal party that they owe it, to that party of which Mr. Wilfred Laurier is the grand chief, not only in our Province, but in the whole Dominion.”

So far so good! The Liberal organ is right! Mr. Laurier and his party put Mr. Mercier into power.

L’Electeur, 3rd June, 1890.—“Mr. Laurier’s itinerary for the week.”—a list of all the places in which he was to speak for Mr. Mercier. That day’s editorial is headed, “The intervention of Hon. Mr. Laurier.” It says: “*Le Canadien* of yesterday publishes a long article to show that Mr. Laurier partakes absolutely of the same ideas as Mr. Mercier in this campaign on the question of provincial autonomy, and yet it reproaches Mr. Laurier with intervening in provincial politics. A little more and the *blue* organ will create a great scandal out of this intervention. But, we ask, what is there to prevent Mr. Laurier from interfering actively in the present struggle? He is chief of the Opposition at Ottawa, chief of the Canadian Liberal party. . . . Moreover, is he not the chief of the Liberal electors, who, on the 17th June, will vote for Mr. Mercier? By this title it is not only his right, but his duty to take part in this struggle.”

This is the election in which Mr. Mercier is to depend upon Mr. Laurier for help; and in return for which Mr.

Laurier will depend upon Mr. Mercier, when the Dominion fight comes off.

L'Electeur, 6th June, 1890.—Report of a meeting at Saint Sauveur: “The cause! It is the *National* cause, and all wish to see it triumph! The party! but all are of the same party; it is a union of friends!” Mr. Laurier’s Speech: “My politics are Mr. Mercier’s! I am of the old school of English Liberals. Mr. Mercier is the chief of the *National* party, but who was ever more Liberal than he is, in his relations with the workmen?” . . . “I come here to preach union and concord. I come here to work with you that the cause of Mr. Mercier may triumph in the coming elections—it is what you all want.” . . . “I hope you are convinced that what Mr. Mercier wants is the triumph of the labour cause. But, mark one thing. I am as much as you are a partisan of that labour cause, though I am not a labourer myself. I have at heart as much as you have the cause you cherish; *but I tell you, in all sincerity, I love the National cause still more than I do the labour cause.*”

Yet Mr. Laurier does not sing his *National* song when in face of other events and other audiences. It matters little what he may call himself or his party, it is a combination of Mercier and Laurier, aided in minor details by Pacaud.

La Patrie, 4th July, 1890.—“The Two Parties Liberal and *National*.” “Already the *Gazette* made the remark yesterday, Mr. Mercier spoke at the reception of the *National* party, and the successes that crowned its efforts. Mr. Laurier, on the contrary, did not say a word about the *National* party; but he expatiated at length on the past, the future aspirations and hopes of the Liberal party. Is there a difference of opinion between the two chiefs, as the *Gazette* would have it understood? We think not.” . . . “Mr. Mercier, our common chief in a struggle undertaken for a particular object in our province, could not speak in the name of one of the great parties of the country without running the risk of wounding some of the troops that support him.” . . . “Such is the only reason why Mr. Mercier used, the other evening, the word *National*, whilst Mr. Laurier exclusively used the name Liberal.”

So Mr. Laurier is a lover of the *National* cause in St. Sauveur, where his speech was intended merely for the ears of his own electors and Mr. Mercier’s friends; but he forgets the *National* and merely speaks of the *Liberal* cause

when he is in a place where his words might militate against his prospects as leader throughout the Dominion. And in Toronto he has nothing at all to do with the *National* cause. Quebec can read his sincerity, Ontario can study his political honesty, and the whole Dominion can perceive his motives. A Nationalist in Quebec, he leaves Nationalism to Mr. Mercier in Montreal, and he is merely a Liberal himself, and, in Toronto, he is *anti-National*, a very Briton—an “old school English Liberal.” He thus speaks to Ontario :

La Patrie, 3rd October, 1889.—“It is said it may be all very fine for me to talk as a Canadian in Ontario, but that I advise the people of Quebec to establish an independent French-Canadian state on the banks of the St. Lawrence. As to myself personally, gentlemen, I resent the odious imputation, and spurn the accusation of wanting one language for Ontario and another for Quebec.” “If there are any amongst my fellow-countrymen of French origin who would dream of establishing a French colony on the banks of the St. Lawrence, I am not one of them. I am not of them, and let friends and opponents be well penetrated with the fact.” “I go farther, and say it would be the direst ingratitude, after seeking the protection of England in order to become great, to strike the friendly hand and to refuse to take our common share with our other fellow-citizens.”

When Dr. Montague quoted from the Quebec speech in the House on the 7th July last, the following dialogue will show how Mr. Laurier tried to back down, and finally was silenced before the whole House of Commons.

Hansard, vol. i, 1891, July 7th, pages 1975-1976.

Mr. Montague—on the Budget—quotes Laurier’s speech as published in the *Globe*—“We will have freedom of trade; we will sweep away these restrictions; we will sweep away the custom-houses between these two countries.” This is in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Laurier—“Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that the speech to which he refers was delivered in French, and that there was not a French reporter present.”

Some hon. members—“Oh, oh!”

Mr. Laurier—“I am quite willing to say that the report in substance gives the sense of my remarks, but is not *verbatim*.”

Mr. Montague—“Well, sir, this extract has been printed in

newspaper after newspaper; it has been before the country for months; and my hon. friend has never until now made a public declaration that the report is incorrect. It shows that hon. gentlemen opposite are in a very bad condition when they have to rise in the House and repudiate the reports of their speeches as printed in their own organs. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman whether or not he ever delivered any such speech as that?"

Mr. Laurier—"I have just told you."

Mr. Montague—"You said nothing, then, about the custom-houses?"

Mr. Laurier—"I have told the hon. gentleman that the speech was delivered impromptu, and that there is no *verbatim* report of it. The hon. gentleman does not expect me to say that I said this word or that word. I have just said that the report gives the substance of my remarks, but not my *verbatim* remarks."

Mr. Montague—"The hon. gentleman does not remember it. I do not ask him to remember it, but the reporter was there and took it down."

Mr. Laurier—"I say that I spoke in French, and that there was not a French reporter there."

And thus did Mr. Laurier, when cornered, strive to cover his tracks. It was not so much the quoted paragraph that frightened him as the fact that some other person might discover how compromisingly contradictory his different speeches and attitudes were.

In closing this act, and before opening the third, last and most important one—the climax of our little drama—it would be well to recall to the reader's mind that we are only using Mr. Laurier's own words or else those of Mr. Mercier or Mr. Pacaud. Our object is to show that those men have been more than politically, that they have been interestedly and amicably allied. We must now follow our chain until we have proven that Mr. Laurier flung all his personal magnetism into the Quebec elections in favor of Mr. Mercier; that Mr. Mercier reciprocated by using his Quebec power to aid Mr. Laurier in the Dominion struggle; that Mr. Mercier originated the Interprovincial Conference for his own ends; that Mr. Laurier subscribed to its resolutions; that Sir John saw the danger to the Dominion in its principles; that its ultimate object was to saddle the Dominion with Mr.

Mercier's political and other liabilities; that Mr. Mercier promised fifteen of a majority to Mr. Laurier; that Mr. Laurier promised, if he got into power, to settle the Quebec accounts; that Pacaud was in every case a "go-between" the Government and all boodlers and contractors; that one of the Langeliers was Mercier's right bower; that another was Laurier's trump card, and that a third was a paid spy of Mercier's party; that Mercier dictated to Pacaud and paid him; that Mercier traded on Laurier's political purity, while Laurier kept up his "old school English Liberalism" as a mask to hide his real motives; in fine, that Laurier not getting into power as he expected to do, the Mercier gang had to go to Europe to borrow, and the Dominion Conservative elections were contested on the strength of Dominion moneys that were to replace the \$100,000 that Pacaud made away with so neatly; and, finally, that Laurier knew every move made or in contemplation upon the chess-board of Quebec politics. We will go farther.

To illustrate, by one example, the Langelier connection, we will refer to the well-known fact that on the week intervening between the day of nomination and the day of election, that is to say, from the 26th February and 5th March, 1891, Mr. Achille Carrière, local member for Gaspé in the Quebec House, and one of Mercier's right hand men, left Quebec with election funds, gold and bills, and all along the line from Levis to Dalhousie distributed the "boodle" to the Liberal agents who met him at the different stations. Previous to Mr. Carrière's passage of beneficence, agents from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and even Ontario came to Quebec and applied to Mercier, Pacaud & Company for funds. The election took place on the Thursday, the 5th of March. The results could not be known until Friday, the 6th, and on the next day Mr. François Langelier and Ernest Pacaud landed in Halifax. Mr. Weldon, ex-M.P., under directions from Mr. Laurier, met these gentlemen, who had the

funds necessary to buy up any members who might be for sale. They met on Sunday, the 8th, at Mr. Jones' house, and there in secret conclave with Mr. Fielding, Senator Power and Mr. Longley, concocted the plan best calculated to do effective work with these funds. Not succeeding in corrupting any of the elected Conservatives they put up \$11,000 to contest eleven constituencies—amongst others Halifax county, and the elections of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine, and in the case of the last mentioned they did not contest his colleague's election. Evidently this was done to annoy the Government, in the hope of shaking the weaker members by the committee revelations that they anticipated having a sweeping effect. As far as New Brunswick is concerned these Quebec agents were not entrusted with the cash, but a cheque payable to the order of Mr. Blair, the Attorney-General, was sent to Mr. Weldon—the Premier could not seemingly be trusted with it. When it reached the political agent he found the payee of the cheque was away up the St. John River, either on a stumping excursion, or some other equally unimportant expedition. They could not get their money until they found the Attorney-General, and the three or four days' chase after that gentleman sufficed to let their plans and motives leak out. In fine the connection of Messrs. Laurier, Mercier, Pacaud, Langelier, Carrière, Fielding, Power, Longley, Jones, Blair, Weldon, and all the leading Liberals is undeniable, and just as undeniable is the fact that the funds Mr. Pacaud had in charge formed the bond of union between them all; and that bond of union consisted of Dominion of Canada money. Not only this, but in Quebec alone \$13,000 of that fund were used as deposits in the thirteen contestations of Conservative seats in that province.

ACT III—1891.

Montreal Herald, January 28th, 1891.—"The Club National banquet, held at the Windsor Hotel last night, must be

voted a success. The attendance was large, the gathering thoroughly representative and well-sustained enthusiasm prevailed. The speaking, also, was of high order. The sentiments enunciated had a substantial ring about them that appealed to the intelligence, as well as to the sentiment, of the audience. All scored good points, but Hon. Mr. Mercier made an effective hit when he announced that if Sir John Macdonald brought on the elections immediately he would put off his trip to Europe in order to be at his post alongside the Liberal chieftain, Hon. Mr. Laurier."

The Herald's Report of the Banquet.—Mr. Laurier spoke shortly, saying he wished to economize his voice in case of a general election. Mr. Mercier gave a detailed account of how the Provincial treasury stood—of the union between the Liberals and National Conservatives—proclaimed himself the head of a *National* government, and closed with saying: "My duty and my place are known; I should be at the side of my esteemed chief, the Hon. W. Laurier, should he so desire it, and I will be there whatever may happen, if God permits."

L'Electeur, 28th January, 1891.—"But this is not all. The presence at Mr. Mercier's side of Mr. Laurier, leader of the Canadian Liberal party, he whom our adversaries surnamed the knight without fear and without reproach, unfolds for us other and vaster horizons."

There is no doubt of it, and away beyond the rim of those horizons are burning volcanos that the eye cannot yet detect, but which, with time, will loom into sight.

L'Electeur, 29th January, 1891.—"The same sentiments gushed out in all the speeches at the banquet. Hon. W. Laurier gave echo to the sentiments of Mr. Mercier; Mr. Mercier gave force and significance extraordinary to the same sentiments when he said, amidst thunders of applause, that he would, if the election rumors were realized, put off his trip to Europe, that he would even hasten back from Paris, if necessary; that his place in the hour of battle was beside his venerated chief, Hon. Wilfred Laurier."

L'Electeur, 30th January, 1891. — Despatch from New York: "Hon. Mr. and Mrs. Laurier, Hon. Mr. and Mrs. Longley, and Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Pacaud reached here this morning and are at the Brunswick Hotel. Mr. Laurier speaks to-night at the Board of Trade Banquet at the Delmonico."

So Mr. Laurier flies, fresh from this banquet-hall where Mr. Mercier promised to stand by him, to New York, to the land of Wiman, Butterworth and Hitt ; and his travelling companion, his *fides achates*, his valet-de-chambre, is the same Mr. Ernest Pacaud, with whom Mr. Laurier seems to have so little to do, the moment there is a cloud on Mr. Pacaud's name, and that his "evil association" might corrupt the liberal leader's "good manners." The scenes are becoming more interesting as we draw towards the crisis.

Montreal Herald, 4th February, 1891 : "Sir John Macdonald's attempt to surprise the country and obtain a snatch verdict before the people would be able to grasp the new phases of the political situation, had led Mr. Mercier and his colleagues, who had arranged to go to Europe and the United States on important public business, to cancel their trips for the present and remain to assist Hon. Mr. Laurier and the Liberals in the campaign now opening."

Montreal Herald, 5th February, 1891 : "Conservative politicians are considerably disturbed by the announcement that Premier Mercier and members of his cabinet have put off their contemplated business trips in order to be able to aid Hon. Mr. Laurier and his liberal friends in the Dominion elections. They had fair warning of his intentions and have no right to complain. Besides Premier Mercier would be more than human, if he did not resent, in the most effective and practical manner, the underhand assaults made upon him and his government by Federal Cabinet Ministers and conservative politicians. It is Mr. Mercier's turn, now, and he can be depended upon to make his power felt on behalf of Liberalism and good government, in *Dominion*, just as he has done in *Provincial politics*."

It is lucky for the Dominion that he, Pacaud and company have not as yet had a chance, through Premier Laurier, to act in Dominion affairs as they have done in Provincial matters.

Montreal Herald, 10th February, 1891 : Report of the Bonsecours Market meeting of the 9th. Extracts from Mr. Mercier's speech : "My duty and my place are known : I must be at the side of my esteemed leader, Hon. Wilfred Laurier, if he wishes it, and with the help of God I shall be there, no matter what happens. *God has permitted it, Mr. Laurier wishes it, and I am*

here at his side, fighting for the triumph of the cause which is so dear to us all. “I and my colleagues have placed ourselves entirely at Mr. Laurier’s disposal, and he can rely upon us in the interesting and hopeful struggle in which he is about to engage.” “Hon. Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolutions of the Interprovincial Conference of 1887, and promised to give effect to them if he comes into power. It is our duty to make him triumph.”

So far we have both these honorable gentlemen carefully fulfilling their mutual pledges and sticking to each other, or rather both sticking to Pacaud, who is the neck-yoke that unites them.

La Patrie, 4th February, 1891.—“*Bonne Nouvelle!* Ah! Mr. Chapleau, you boasted yesterday in the *Witness* that Mr. Mercier would not help Mr. Laurier! You had already forgotten that Mr. Mercier, at the Club National banquet, had several times called Mr. Laurier his chief, and that he had promised solemnly to be at his side if you or your colleagues undertook to play us one of those fox tricks at which your old chief is such an adept. To put a little courage into the stomachs of your partisans you hastened to tell them that it would be to Mr. Mercier’s interest to stay quietly at home.”

There is no doubt to-day that it would have been very much to both Mercier’s and Laurier’s interest had the former followed Mr. Chapleau’s advice.

La Patrie, 5th February, 1891.—“Not only Mr. Mercier has put off his European trip until after the elections, but he has recalled his colleagues, Messrs. Chas. Langelier and Robidoux, from New York, and he is busy organizing.”

La Patrie, 6th February, 1891.—Speaking of Mr. Chapleau “He looks well to come and kick up a dust because Mr. Mercier and all our friends in the local Cabinet of Quebec declared they were going to rush into the fight to help Mr. Laurier.”

La Patrie, 10th February, 1891.—From Mr. Mercier’s Bonsecours Market speech: “As to the financial relations between the Provinces and the Dominion, the execution of the decision of the Interprovincial Conference would give to each province the means of developing its resources, favoring its education, instruction and colonization.”

Which means to give Mr. Mercier all the means he needed from the Dominion treasury to pay his provincial debts and to keep up Messrs. Pacaud, Langelier & Co.

L'Electeur, 10th February, 1891.—“ Our adversaries understand now that, with Mr. Mercier at his side, Mr. Laurier is invincible in Quebec. *Mr. Mercier cares little for Tory scruples.*”

We should think that his regard for any species of scruples, Tory or otherwise, is very slim. At least the last four years of his erratic career would seem to indicate that he kept little account of either scruples or drammms.

L'Electeur of the 11th and 12th February contain columns upon columns uniting Mr. Laurier and Mr. Mercier as the Damon and Pythias of Quebec Liberalism. These articles would be too long to cite, howsoever interesting they may be ; still, for our present purpose, and due consideration for our space being had, we must leave them to the gleaners of political information who are sufficiently interested to look up the files.

L'Electeur, 11th February, 1891, gives a translation of an interview had by a *Star* reporter with Mr. Mercier, in which the latter says :

“ We will give Mr. Laurier fifteen of a majority in this province. I have come to place myself at the disposal of the Montreal district committee, and I will remain in harness until the end of the campaign. I shall have with me Mr. Robidoux, the Attorney-General, and Mr. Duhamel, the Commissioner of Crown Lands. At Quebec, Mr. Shehyn, the Treasurer, Mr. Ross, the President of the Council, and Mr. Garneau, the Commissioner of Public Works, will be in charge, with the same committee that we had at the last provincial general elections in June. The organization will be the same in all the province, and the result will probably be better.”

There is no back-door business about that. The full weight and influence of the Quebec Cabinet were certainly cast into the balance for Mr. Laurier. In the same number of that organ Mr. Pacaud writes : “ Mr. Mercier has bound himself by a *solemn engagement* to give at least a majority of fifteen votes to Mr. Laurier ; that is to say, to put him into power.” This engagement, the alliance of which Mr. Laurier speaks, the compact of which Mr. Pacaud writes, must surely be a bond of union between the leaders.

L'Electeur, 16th February, 1891.—Mr. Mercier's speech at St. Ambroise, County of Quebec. "At the request of my chief, Hon. W. Laurier, I come here to respectfully but firmly demand that you support the Opposition candidate in this struggle. . . . I am your friend; you are my friends; stand together; stand united, and work for the victory of our chief—Wilfred Laurier."

L'Electeur, 23rd February, 1891.—Speaking of Mr. François Langelier. "A man who in Quebec is Mr. Mercier's right arm, whom the latter honors with his greatest friendship, and to whom he does not hesitate to confide most important missions, charging him to go to the Supreme Court to represent the Province of Quebec. We need not say that Mr. Mercier clings in a particular manner to the idea of Mr. Langelier's re-election."

There is no wonder at that. Mr. Pacaud might have added that Mr. Mercier paid Mr. Langelier \$3,000 for going to Ottawa and rising in court and only saying that he was the attorney of the Quebec Government. Perhaps at that rate Mr. Langelier will be able to make a hole in Mr. Mercier's borrowed millions when he sends in his bill for defending his own brother and the Count before the Committee of the Senate.

L'Electeur, 25th February, 1891.—"So great is the cry of Sir John's partisans in the West against Mr. Laurier that they say Mr. Mercier's close friendship compromises him."

Indeed events have proven that those Western people were right, for most undoubtedly Mr. Mercier's close friendship is at this moment compromising Mr. Laurier in a manner that should shock the high political morality of the leader of the Opposition and make him shiver at the thought of himself.

L'Electeur, 6th March, 1891.—"In the Province of Quebec Mr. Mercier has right royally kept his word. He promised Mr. Laurier fifteen votes of a majority; he will give him twenty-five when all is counted up."

Quite extravagant is Mr. Pacaud becoming, but then it is natural for him to be a spendthrift, whether in matters of money, notes or promises!

L'Electeur, 12th March, 1891.—In an interview with Mr. Mercier by a *Star* reporter, after Mr. Mercier spoke of how he had kept his promise to Mr. Laurier, he concluded by saying: “*I have no doubt that if Hon. Mr. Laurier becomes First Minister of the Dominion the Province will get whatever it asks.*”

That is to say, Mr. Mercier would get whatever *he* liked out of the Dominion, and would rule the roost in Quebec at the expense of all the other people of Canada.

Mr. Laurier, fortunately for Canada, did not become Premier of the Dominion, and Mr. Mercier was obliged to go off to Europe and prosecute his original plan of raising a few millions upon the credit of his impoverished Province, which few millions he seems not to be able to secure, without considerable unlooked-for trouble. Mr. Pacaud is trying his hand over there;—will he succeed where Mercier's great blow-out seems to have failed? The Dominion Parliament was called for despatch of business, Mr. Laurier came to Ottawa again, as leader of a very dissatisfied Opposition. The fearful raid, in the way of committee investigations, was made upon the Government. Strange to say, Mr. Laurier kept religiously aloof from all the committee investigations and left the scandal hunting to Messrs. Tarte, Davies, Mullock, Sommerville and other subordinates. Mr. Laurier was wise in his course, for none better than he knew what a fearful boomerang all these proceedings might prove to be. Conscious of his own danger, he kept out of the way, and trusted to his star to save him from exposure. But he was not thus to escape. In the midst of their “hue and cry” a meteor shot up, athwart the darkness of the sphere, and it threatened to burst over the Liberal camp in Quebec. The now notorious Baie des Chaleurs Railway scandal was brought up in the Senate Committee of Privileges and Elections. Messrs. Armstrong, Charles and John C. Langelier, the Hon. Count Mercier and Mr. Ernest Pacaud, as well as several others, became at once compromised in the most scandalous transaction that ever

disgraced Canadian annals. Barefaced public robbery, in which the Ali Babba was Count Mercier, and his chief lieutenant was Ernest Pacaud. It is not for us here to examine into the details of that abominable and shameless deal ; our object is to show that the leader of the Opposition at Ottawa, the Hon. Wilfred Laurier, the bosom friend, political chief and general associate of Mr. Mercier, the school-fellow, partner, patron and travelling companion of Mr. Pacaud, not only had a share in the transaction, but that he has been privy to the Hegira of Pacaud, and has always had full knowledge of the state of Mr. Mercier's affairs. We have traced their intimacy in a hurried and superficial manner ever since Mr. Laurier has had his eye on the premiership and since Mr. Mercier had his eye on the Dominion coffers. Let us take up, then, the last move in the closing act of our peculiar little drama and behold the mask of hypocrisy fall from the face of that great leader who has so long wrapped himself in his cloak of dignity.

Before entering upon this final consideration, I would draw especial attention to the peculiar fact that when Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Blake led the Liberals they were really the chieftains, each in his turn, of the party ; but Mr. Laurier, like a minor or a quasi-interdicted person, cannot act without his advisory committee, from which all his instructions seem to come. His party may consider him an elegant figure-head, but a very unreliable head. He does not lead, nor is his will law ; they—the satellites—lead, and he follows their dictation. They could not even trust him with a say in the scandal investigations ; Cartwright, Mills, Davies and Charleton, and the minor characters like Mullock, Lister, Somerville and McMullen, and a few still more questionable personages like Tarte, Amyot and Langelier, has each a duty to perform, but Laurier is kept in the back ground. Does he feel the sting ? or is he indifferent to or powerless against the humiliating slight ?

"The wise man of old," says the *True Witness*, "who oh'd that his enemy would write a book would have been happy in having Mr. Mercier's chief newspaper organ in the ranks of those he hated. *L'Electeur* has not exactly written a book; but it has written an article, and when the Liberals at Ottawa read it they will have fresh reason to curse the day they helped to make Mr. Mercier premier of the unfortunate province. Briefly stated, *L'Electeur* says a portion of the money its director blackmailed out of Mr. Armstrong was used in payment of notes made to raise money for the Liberal party to use in Federal politics. Mr. Laurier and the other chiefs at Ottawa are expecting political benefit from the proceeds of these notorious securities, made more disreputable by the manner in which they were discharged." The tale is best told in *L'Electeur's* own words, and here they are:

L'Electeur, 25th August, 1891—*Editorial*.

THE OFFICIAL DEFENCE.

'The Conservative press is making a great noise over certain notes bearing the signatures of Messrs. Mercier, F. Langelier, C. P. A. Pelletier, Charles Langelier and Tarte, which have been paid by Mr. Pacaud. Let us see if there is anything wrong about them. We say, first, that the date of these notes establishes the fact that they were made after the general elections for the Commons long before there was any question of the settlement of the Baie des Chaleurs railway matter. From this there is established clearly two facts incontestably: Our friends have not used this money for the elections, because they were over, and, in the second place, it did not come from Mr. Armstrong, seeing that his affair had not been settled, and that it was not in question.

RAISING OF A FUND.

'Here is the explanation of these notes. The general elections were over. Our adversaries were contesting all the elections of the candidates who had been elected to support Mr. Laurier. The principal party men at Quebec, Mr. Mercier at the head, resolved to raise a fund for the purpose of contesting the election of the Conservative candidates. Now, everyone knows that a deposit of \$1,000 in each contestation is a part of the expenses. Messrs. Mercier, Pelletier and Langelier signed the notes, which were discounted, and, with the proceeds, the deposits were made in a large number of contested elections. They

were the means of protecting our friends. As the contestations are settled one way or another the deposits will be retired and used to redeem the notes thus discounted. Here is the history of these notes.

HOW THE FUND MAKERS WERE INDEMNIFIED.

‘But it will be said, and we will be charged, that Mr. Pacaud paid them with the money obtained from Armstrong. That Mr. Pacaud should be blamed for having obtained money from Mr. Armstrong is open to argument; but what harm is there in Messrs. Mercier, Pelletier and Langelier having signed notes destined to be paid later by deposits coming from the settlement of contested elections? It has not been established, and they are powerless to do so, that Mr. Pacaud consulted any of these gentlemen before paying these notes. Mr. Pacaud received some money from Armstrong; it is his property and with this money he paid these notes, waiting for repayment until the deposits are remitted. An important detail is that these deposits are made personally in the name of Mr. Pacaud. We propose the question to all sensible men: Was there anything reprehensible in the signing of these notes? No, without a doubt. They did nothing but to repeat what they have done before to assure the success of their party, and it owes them their profound thanks.’

“There was never a straighter case of corruption admitted even in the annals of the Canadian Liberal party. *L'Electeur's* article would be remarkable anywhere outside of Quebec. It is an admission, without the slightest apology or regret, that Pacaud got the \$100,000 from Armstrong. That money it has been shown, was wrung from a claimant on the treasury who was put under the fear that if he did not pay it he would get nothing at all. Part of it was used for party campaign purposes in the interest of the Liberal party at Ottawa. All this was done and is told of as a matter of course. The chief recognized exponent of Liberal ideas in the Province of Quebec sees nothing wrong in it. Nothing could better illustrate the utter debasement of public opinion among those who here claim to be called by the honored name of Liberals.”

Hon. Mr. Laurier wrote a letter to the *Ottawa Citizen*, dated 14th August, 1891. The report of the proceedings in the Senate committee had stated that Pacaud got permission from Mercier and Laurier to go to Europe, just

at the moment when his presence was required in Ottawa; that Pacaud had been threatening for a long time to go to Europe, but was watching to see whether this boodle scandal would be unearthed or not. As soon as it burst upon the political sky Pacaud shot across the Atlantic. After quoting the report of what Senator Tassé said in the committee, Mr. Laurier does not hesitate to place his name upon record in a letter to the *Ottawa Citizen*, published in the edition of the 16th August, 1891. It must have been a very close call that could induce the leader of a great party to descend to the risk of a newspaper controversy over his own signature. But probably the advisory council dictated the letter, or forced him to do what his better judgment should have forbidden. In that letter he says, referring to *L'Electeur* of the 12th August:

“The impression is here conveyed that on Monday, the 10th instant, after the investigation on the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Bill had commenced before the Railway Committee of the Senate, I was consulted by Mr. Pacaud as to whether he should or should not go to Europe. The insinuation is absolutely contrary to facts. Mr. Pacaud is the chief editor of the newspaper *L'Electeur*. I have been in frequent communication with him as to the conduct of the paper. On Tuesday, the 4th instant, and not on Monday, the 10th instant, he wrote to me to ask me if I would object to his going to Europe during the session, and I answered him at once, on the receipt of his letter, that I had no objection. At that time I had never heard that Mr. Pacaud's presence would be required before the Railway Committee of the Senate. If at that time he had been summoned as a witness to appear before the committee, I was not aware of it, and, as far as my knowledge goes, he had not been summoned, nor had his name been mentioned in any connection whatever with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Bill.

“Yours truly,

“WILFRID LAURIER.”

“Ottawa, 14th.”

Let us now see what *L'Electeur* of the 12th August, 1891, says:

“For several months past Mr. Ernest Pacaud, director of this paper, proposed to take a month's vacation that he would spend

in visiting Europe. This trip his physician prescribed for him, but had to be put off from month to month on account of the multitude of his business affairs. Monday of last week he wrote to Hon. Mr. Laurier to submit to him his holiday plan, and the next day he wrote to Mr. Mercier in a similar sense. One and the other having acquiesced, Mr. Pacaud was enabled to execute his plan and to go to New York to take this week's steamer. He has taken a return ticket by the 'Parisian,' which will leave Liverpool the 17th September next."

Now the dates little signify. We won't quibble about the 4th or the 10th. The facts are these: that Pacaud had to get permission from Laurier and Mercier before going to Europe; that he only wanted to go for *one* month; that he should go before the close of an exceptional session; that, even as important as he must be to his masters, he should leave when his party was passing through a severe crisis, and when a business with which he is the most deeply connected was becoming the subject of public investigation. Mr. Laurier claims that he did not know that Pacaud's name was connected with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway affair, nor that Pacaud had been summoned to attend. Too transparent! He had been told of it previous to writing Pacaud by one of his own party—one who bears the cognomen of Aananias. Perhaps Mr. Laurier did not believe him. In any case a lawyer of Mr. Laurier's acumen and experience could not but know that Pacaud would be summoned as the principal witness; a politician of Mr. Laurier's foresight, knowledge of detail, and past connection with Mercier and Pacaud, could not but know that his protégé, Pacaud, was the paid agent of his own political twin brother, Mercier. The experience of the investigations in the Commons' Committees alone should teach him, apart from his professional experience, that the inquisition turned upon Pacaud's evidence—the very statement of the charges made it clear to everyone. His intimacy with Mercier, and his control of Pacaud, rendered it absolutely impossible that he should be ignorant of how Pacaud got

his money; also of what he did for it and with it, and of the fact that the investigation imperatively demanded Pacaud's presence. He knew the investigation had commenced, and yet he examined Pacaud's plans and granted him a permit to place the Atlantic, for a month, between himself and the Senate. If Mr. Laurier pretends he did not know all these things, he cannot have read the Liberal press of the last three or four years; he must have forgotten every transaction as quickly as it occurred; in fact, he must be devoid of all ordinary intelligence and is unfit not only to lead, but even to follow in the ranks of any party. If he did know all this, what are we to think of his veracity, honor, straightforwardness and loudly-vaunted political purity? Mr. Laurier is either a blind simpleton, imposed upon by Pacaud and lead by the nose by Mercier, or else he is a knowing knave and an accomplished hypocrite. In either case he is not fit to be trusted with the affairs of a country like Canada. It might suit Mercier and his boodle-gang to see Laurier at the head of the Dominion Government, but it would be a sad day for the country.

EPILOGUE.

What are we to conclude from all the scenes in this little charade? Are we to believe that Mr. Laurier is dishonest personally? Are we to imagine that he is one of the Quebec boodlers? Not at all! Far be it from us to even insinuate that Mr. Laurier ever had or dreamed of having any pecuniary share in the deals so recently brought to light. But what we must conclude, and what inevitably flows from these premises, is that Mr. Laurier has been so intimately connected with the other characters in this drama that he knew all about their actions and motives, and that for purposes other and higher than the mere grasping of some few dollars he has been willing to aid and abet them in their programme of plunder.

Mr. Laurier has high-soaring ambition—it is his all-absorbing passion ; Mr. Mercier has extreme vanity, combined with an over-weening love of power—and he reck little what the means are, provided they help him towards the gratification of these inclinations ; Mr. Pacaud has a love for notoriety and an all-absorbing cupidity, and for these he will follow through every maze, no matter how dark or intricate, provided they are satiated. Laurier, to attain the goal of his ambition, required Mercier's help, and Mercier could not render him much assistance without the aid of Pacaud, their mutual confidential man. Pacaud gives all his energies and talents to their cause, in the hopes of securing high prices for his services ; Mercier casts his powers into the balance in order to secure for himself the means of satisfying his personal vanity and the cupidity of his friends ; Laurier lends his assistance in the same struggle in order to keep Mercier and Pacaud on hand, as rungs in the ladder of his ambition. Let Laurier get into power and he will have reaped all the reward that *he* craves ; but then he will have to keep his *compact* with Mercier, and the latter will have attained the object of his intrigues ; but then he will have to support Pacaud out of the ill-gotten gains, so that the latter will have his avariciousness satisfied, and all this will be done at the expense of the Dominion of Canada. It is for these reasons that Mercier plays Damon to Laurier's Pythias and Pacaud plays Valet to both. So, then, Pacaud and his crew are bound to the compact by the link of their unscrupulous cupidity ; Mercier is bound by the link of his vain-glorious love of notoriety and wealth ; and Laurier is bound by the link of his more-than-Napoleonic ambition. The motives are different, the objects to be attained are diversified, but the means to be used are the same, and the malign effects upon the country are identical. Judged by their motives, Mr. Laurier stands away aloof from the other conspirators ; judged by their actual deeds, and

the effects thereof, he is as deeply in the mesh as either or all of the others. The worst and best that can be said of him is, that Hon. Wilfred Laurier "does not love Canada less but Laurier more;" that he would sacrifice his country's name, fame and future, at the shrine of his own ambition, and he scruples not what means he uses, provided the goal of his life is reached,—the Premiership of Canada. In fact, to sum up Mr. Laurier's political character, motives, ideas, actions and all, we could not more fittingly close than by using his ominous words: "We must make use of questionable means very often in political life, the instrument is of little consequence compared to the results that we can produce with it."⁴ That gentleman has given ample evidence of his belief in, and practice of, this Machiavelian doctrine. What with playing one part in Ontario, another in Quebec, and audaciously denying both in the House; with preparing, reading, and correcting the proofs of a Quebec speech, and then proclaiming that he was wrongly reported; with repudiating, on the floor of Parliament, what he boasted of before the electors; with knowingly and deliberately misquoting paragraphs and pamphlets before Parliament, and attributing the authorship to Conservatives, when he knew who wrote, corrected, and was paid from Liberal funds for publishing the same; with denials of connections, compacts, agreements, or even sympathies with Mercier, Pacaud and their junto, and actually dictating to them all the while—what, with all these things, can we do other than admit, howsoever reluctantly, that the Leader of the Opposition is no better than his political associates. It is hard to feel that such an idol should be hurled from its pedestal, but the lover of his country—like the Catechumens of old—must become iconolast for the sake of the fame, honor, and well-being of the land he loves, and must tear away the veil from the shrine of the Delphic deity, if we wish to see the great principle of Political Truth prevail. Future politicians may learn

from Laurier that, if unrestrained ambition can raise a man from the lowest position, it can also prostrate him from the highest ; and from Mercier they may learn that there is no point so elevated to which the unscrupulous may not aspire, and there is no depth so profound into which their machinations may not precipitate them. It matters little that for a while their audacity would seem to prosper, that success panted after their unfolded standard, and that the eyes of the people were dazzled and captivated by the very splendors of their aberrations ; it could only be for a time—the deception could not endure—and to-day, in the very banquet of their triumph, the *Mane, Theckel, Phares*, of a new political dispensation blaze upon the walls, and the cup of anticipated triumph is dashed from these lips of the revellers !