

opposite shall be based? Are they so much affected in their policy by a difference of 4 or 5 per cent in the protection of the United States, when at least it will go to 50 per cent? Hon. gentlemen must answer that question, if not here, to the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite must recollect that there are sensible, honest, intelligent people in this country who are watching them, who cannot believe up to this day that it can ever be said in a British country that a great party would spend its whole life-time in opposition in support of a certain policy, and the very moment it came into power would take up the exact converse which it had been opposing for eighteen years. "I am a Liberal of the old Liberal school," is the boast my hon. friend the leader of the Government has often made, the boast he makes nearly every time he gets upon the platform. Can he point out to me an English Liberal of the old Liberal school who would put himself in the position that the hon. gentleman and his party have taken? An English Liberal of the old Liberal school has the sturdy love of principle and honour which would prevent him doing that, which would prevent him from leading his party along a line which means the repudiation of every promise given to the electors when the party making the promise stood in front of them asking them for their votes. But there is one phase of this matter as to the keeping of pledges—no, I beg pardon, as to the breaking of pledges—which demands special notice, and that is the compact made between the Liberals through the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Patrons of Industry. The Patrons of Industry, without going into their history, without saying a word as to the basis of their organization, as to the objects they had in view, or as to the means they adopted to achieve those objects, at the opening of the contest between the Liberals and the Conservatives were a large and important organization in Ontario. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) catered for the Patron vote. He catered for it by bringing in proposals and trying to make them legislation in this House, knowing that he could not make them legislation, knowing exactly what he was doing and the purpose for which he was doing it. In this seat or hereabouts, in tones of virtuous indignation, he railed against the Governor's General's salary. The Patrons do not want Government House here at all, so their platform said. It was monstrous, he thought, that a salary of \$50,000 should be paid by the poor people of Canada to the Governor General. That salary ought to be reduced, and the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill to reduce it. Why? Was it a good thing to do then? Then it is a better thing for him to do now, when he has got the power to do it. Will he do it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. He has accomplished his purpose. He is where he is. What cares he for the principles of a month or a year or two years ago. The Postmaster General catered to the Patrons in another point. He was not going to have any passes used by members of Parliament. A man could not be independent who took a pass. Oh, it was a terrible thing to take a pass. The very fact that you had it in your pocket made you a slave of the railway company. Whether all your brother members had them or not, it affected your independence, and it was wrong. He is where he can prohibit it now, if he has any influence with his Government. Will he, has he, attempted it? He has gained his purpose; he is where he is, and the Patrons are where they are. The Patrons have an abhorrence of the Senate, they want it abolished. Has any Liberal behind the Government benches yet moved to abolish the Senate, or are they diligently appointing their friends to vacancies, and praying for other senators to die that they may appoint other friends? You have heard of that Bashaw with three tails. The Minister of Trade and Commerce made a song thereon and applied it to my late friend, Sir Leonard Tilley; and he thought that a Bashaw with three tails was nothing to a Cabinet Minister with a son-in-law. How does he think it is now? Is it better to be a Bashaw with three tails and sporting in Turkey, or to be a Minister with a son to whom he gives an office?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Or a cousin.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, but I never sang the song of the Bashaw. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is a remnant of a bright historic period which had much of virtue and worth about it. He is, where he is; but he has a fraction of Tory principles in him yet. He has failed in this respect, and he feels his failure; but my impression is yet, that his seat is not comfortable to him when, as an English gentleman and a knight, he passed his word to the electorate of this country and to-day sits there without dissent and goes back on his word. The Postmaster General was so virtuously indignant that there should be some members of this Parliament so lost to all sense of independence as to accept from the Government an office if one were to be vacant, or as to contemplate, when their seats become vacant by effluxion of time, going into the position of a judgeship or something else—so virtuously indignant was he that he introduced first, a resolution, and then a Bill, to make it a high crime and misdemeanour for a single member of Parliament to take an office within a year after he had actually resigned, or ceased to become a member of this House. He is to-day a member of a Government that can make that principle law if they like, or if he likes. Has he done it? No,