

party leaders, subsequent to the general elections of 1887, that an early appeal should be made to friends of the party for substantial assistance, so as to make the necessary preparations for the next general elections, the only Liberal in Toronto who was asked to subscribe, and positively refused, was Mr. S. H. Janes. He told a friend and myself, when presented with the subscription book, that he had no funds for party purposes.

Well, Sir, immediately that was heard, and immediately that letter was sent abroad, these purists in South Oxford decided that Mr. Janes was unworthy of the nomination of the Liberal party, and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was selected as a candidate once more; due to the fact evidently that he had been more liberal in the giving of substantial aid. Mr. Speaker, this is a new phrase we have. We have heard it in times past called "Big Push"; we have heard it called "human devices"; we have heard it called "putting down bribery and corruption"; we have heard it called "mesmerism"; we have heard it called "relief for the poor"; but here is a new phrase in the vocabulary of purity: "Substantial aid," and to my mind it expresses it better than any of the other terms. I understand now—and here is another evidence that appears to me as if my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is being stabbed under the fifth rib by some of his friends—I understand that the Liberal party of Toronto are advertising for a new campaign song. Evidently the old song he sings seems to have been played out in the minds of gentlemen in Toronto, because they are asking for a new campaign song. I would suggest to my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and who is the poet of his party, who it is said is competing for the prize, that he should compose a poem in which he should employ his genius in settling in proper background, before the electorate of this country, these beautiful gems which are evidence of Liberal purity. But, after the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) had his nomination, he was not even then safe, and his ribs were still in danger, because my hon. friend said that there is a Liberal paper published in the town of Aylmer, in the province of Quebec, and that Liberal paper had something to say in regard to my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and here is what it said. Nothing ever so hard was said of him by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House:

An enthusiastic Liberal of Montreal said the other day: If the Lord would only lay Sir Richard Cartwright on a bed of sickness for the next six months, nothing in the Dominion or out of it could prevent the Liberal party getting into power.

That, Sir, is how my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) seems to be appreciated among

HON. W. H. M. 1 1/2

the very gentlemen who he says are so enthusiastically united against the Conservative party of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, who are the gentlemen who are asking the electors of this country to dismiss this Government, and to place them in power? They are gentlemen who have always claimed electoral purity and who have always practised electoral corruption. They are the men who, in 1874, passed an Act forbidding corruption at elections, and yet in the next election no less than thirty of these were shown to have purchased their seats; and since the introduction of that law, eighty-three Liberal purists have fallen, to 48 Conservatives. Eight purist Liberals have been disqualified to one Conservative. They are the gentlemen who have always claimed that they were the party of righteous legislation in regard to election matters, and yet I remember when they were in power, that every one of these gentlemen voted for a Bill to take a Liberal township, a Liberal stronghold, from a constituency in which it had done its duty for a Liberal candidate at the general election, and to place it over into another constituency where it might do double duty in a by-election. Every one of the Liberals, Sir, voted for it under the guise of righteous legislation. They are the gentlemen who claim to be the party of low taxation, but I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, as I have challenged them in the country, to name one single item in all their five years of power—except the one item of coal oil, and then they took off an excise duty on coal oil and put a customs tax on tea to make up the loss—on which they reduced taxation. I say that in all these five years of power, they never reduced one single dollar of taxation on the people of this country, but on the contrary, they constantly added taxation on their shoulders, in all adding a customs taxation of three million dollars. Not only that, Sir, but they tell us: They are men who want to take office for the public good. I have their campaign sheet here which says "All they want is office for the public good." Look at them, Mr. Speaker, see the hungry look in their faces and see if it is the public good they are after. When they went into power on just the same cry before, only three or four years elapsed when eight of their Cabinet Ministers "who went into power for the public good," slipped into office for their private good," and one Cabinet Minister who went into office "for the public good," or rather for his family's good, put fifteen of his relatives as pensioners in the public treasury of this country. Sir, the fact is, as I shall show, that in five years of office these Liberals made such a record of blundering stupidity and incapacity, that they were hurled from power by an indignant electorate and so long as the electors of this country remember that they ever were in