



The more you learn about

## Gourlay Pianos

the more you'll want to learn. When you know the GOURLAY as it is you will be all eagerness to possess one. That is when you know how instantly responsive is the touch, how sympathetic and rich the tone, how exquisitely cased, how lastingly built.

It would interest you to know how many modern pianos of standard make are taken in exchange for GOURLAY Pianos. Nothing but the marked superiority of the GOURLAY could occasion this. Shall we tell you more of this superiority?

Write for Booklet

We ship on approval anywhere in Canada.

*Gourlay, Winter Leeming*

Head Office:

189 Yonge Street, Toronto

Winnipeg Warerooms:

279 Donald Street

### A Matchless Bargain For Ladies!



We wish to quickly introduce our goods and secure new customers, so we will send: One handsome Gold Plated Bracelet, with padlock charm, full size; one gem set Birthday Ring, 100 Fancy Silk pieces, and 10 yards of Silk Ribbon, all for 25 cents, or 3 lots for 65 cents, postpaid. Biggest value in the world. Understand 25 cents pays for all—the bracelet, ring, silks and ribbon. Address, H. Buchanan Co., 35 & 37 Frankfort Street, New York. P.S.—Canadian stamps accepted.

dishonest, to the rich man and to the poor man alike. With the reservations I have made I am ready to uphold the pension system, provided you put it on a moral basis and on a basis that can appeal to the fair sense of the people of Canada. Again, I shall be frank and go straight to the point, because general principles are better illustrated by concrete facts. I take the list of those who are enjoying these pensions as given by the Minister of Finance in reply to the member for South York. The first on the list is Sir Hector Langevin. I have a great deal of consideration for a part of the career of Sir Hector Langevin; he was one of the fathers of confederation. But at the same time when, after an inquiry by the parliament of Canada, it was found that Sir Hector Langevin had administered his department in such a way that he was obliged to step out of public life, disgraced—perhaps more sinned against by his friends than sinning himself—it is most immoral that the parliament of Canada which declared that man unworthy of presiding over a great department of government, should seven years afterwards decide to pay him a pension for the rest of his life.

What inducement is there for a minister of the Crown to be honest and keep an iron hand upon his department, if he is going to be treated in exactly the same way as the man who has been chased out of public life on account of his malversation? The second on the list is Sir Charles Tupper, and nothing has appeared against Sir Charles Tupper in the same way as against Sir Hector Langevin—but Sir Charles Tupper is by no means a pauper. The same gentleman who published in his newspaper that it was unfair for members of parliament to attack the pensions paid to ministers, stated also in *La Patrie* that most of the ex-ministers had entered public life with a fair amount of means and had gone out paupers. I never heard that Sir Charles Tupper had made great financial sacrifices on the altar of his country. I think Sir Charles Tupper was much poorer when he entered public life than when he left it. I will assume that he made his fortune by fair means, while being High Commissioner in England, Minister of Railways, Prime Minister, leader of the opposition; but, if in discharging his duties to the country he found a way for building up a fortune, that is

no reason why the people of Canada should now pay him a pension for the rest of his life. Then as to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, I never heard that he was in need of charity from the people of Canada. Take Sir Adolphe Caron. Undoubtedly Sir Adolphe Caron has lost a large fortune in public life, but I have never heard that that fortune was lost for the benefit of the people of Canada. It is not our fault if ministers should go into reckless speculations and lose their money. If any member of this House or if any minister should by reckless speculation be ruined in fortune is it fair that he should ask the people of Canada to compensate him on that account? Then there is Sir John Carling. Surely Sir John Carling is not on the verge of starvation and is not waiting for \$3,500 a year to make an allowance for his children. Surely Sir John Carling by his ability, and by his honesty of which I have no doubt, has built up an enormous fortune for himself. But his service as a minister is no reason why we should pay him a pension when we see around us so many civil servants who are living on a small allowance after thirty years of service to the country.

If Sir John Carling is not wealthy I will withdraw what I have said. I always understood that Sir John Carling had built up a fortune at the head of a prosperous industry, but if that be not so, then Sir John Carling comes under another class, of which I say that the country should not pay pensions to gentlemen who are members of the House of Commons or of the Senate. I would make the rule with regard to the ex-ministers so that the moment they are beaten by their electors or cease to be Senators, they should be entitled to their pension if their private means is not sufficient to sup-

port them. But so long as they are members of this parliament and receive a salary—I shall always call it a salary in the future—there is no reason why they should be entitled to a pension which is supposed to be given to men who are no longer in the public service. This rule will apply to Sir John Carling, to the Hon. Mr. Costigan, to the Hon. Mr. Foster, and to the Hon. Mr. Haggart, who are members of either Houses of parliament.

So far as Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper is concerned, he is a practising lawyer with a large practice. He is a young man who comes entirely within the category of those whom the hon. member for East Grey has defined in a general way as being still too young to be pensioned by the country. There still remains the three ex-cabinet ministers who have stepped out of this government. There is first the Hon. J. I. Tarte, the gentleman who has written the articles I have referred to. I do not begrudge the services which have been rendered to this country by Mr. Tarte; but every one knows that when he came into this parliament he was in a straightened condition, and he is now at the head of one of the most prosperous journals in Montreal; and his sons—I knew them when they had not such means—parade around the island of Montreal in an automobile, and sometimes in a fine equipage, and they have a very comfortable steam launch on the St. Lawrence. All this has been done in five or six years. I do not say that it was done as a result of the entrance of Mr. Tarte into the ranks of ministers; but certainly it shows that he does not fall within the category of those who have sacrificed themselves for the country. So far as the Hon. A. G. Blair is concerned, I do not know anything about his private means; but the circumstances connected with his resignation from the government do not entitle him to claim consideration. I am not very strong on party allegiance as every one knows. I claim the right to vote against my party whenever I choose. I have received no favors from my party; I have always refused to accept from my party contributions towards my election expenses. But when a man conspires with speculators, as Mr. Blair did with Mr. Russell and with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, he is not worthy to be pensioned by the people of Canada. There remains the last but not the least, the Hon. Clifford Sifton. I do not know what his financial circumstances are, but I do not think he comes under the heading of those self-sacrificing heroes who have lost everything they earned in their private capacity by serving their country. Everyone knows that the hon. member for Brandon arrived in Ottawa a few years ago in very modest circumstances, and that he has stepped out of the government to all appearances not at all a pauper requiring a pension at the hands of the people of Canada. I say of him what I say of Sir Charles Tupper and every other member of the past and present governments, that I do not claim until it is proved that the hon. member for Brandon has built up his fortune at the expense of the people of Canada; but he was at the head of one of the largest departments of this government, and if he could, out of his salary of \$7,000 and his indemnity build up a large fortune, this proves that he did not sacrifice himself for his country. It is sometimes observed that politics act in a strange way towards some people. When I entered politics I had four horses and a country house. Now I have no horse and no country house. But I have seen members of the government who when they entered it had no horse and no house at all, and now they have several horses and several houses. I do not want to impute any thing unworthy of public men to these gentlemen to whom politics has been so fortunate; but what I have stated proves my contention that the fact that a man has been a minister of the crown for five years is not necessary prima facie evidence that he has sacrificed himself for the country.

MEMBERS' SALARY SHOULD DEPEND ON WORK DONE.

He does not receive a pension, I think that is provided for by the law; and I will say this for him, since my hon. friend has referred to him, he was a man