

lic questions which were debated in this House, and yet said no word. Not until a year and a half had passed and he felt that which had been promised him by the Premier of this country was likely to slip out of his grasp, did he make the ignoble kick on ground of patronage, while questions of principle had been passed over again and again. Will the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) justify his Government? And will my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) justify his leader in holding out—no, not holding out, but actually putting into the pocket of a member of this House—the promise of either a judgeship or a governorship, a promise which he had to implement, not because of good will, but because forced by the revolt of his followers against delaying the gift of patronage to his supporter? Sir, who cannot remember that after Mr. Masson, a member of this House, and a supporter of the previous Administration, was appointed to a judgeship in the western part of Ontario, appointed at the end of a Parliament—though, I suppose, that makes no difference in principle, still, it was at the end of a Parliament—who cannot remember how these hon. gentlemen, who to-day fill Ministers' seats, were loud in their declarations against the iniquity of this thing? Why, Sir, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) then described the appointment as a crime on the part of the Government, and a shame, and a disgrace. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated that Mr. Masson had been sitting one session, if not two, in this House in practical defiance of the Independence of Parliament Act, and, to all intents and purposes, with that appointment in his pocket. And such instances can be multiplied twenty times, showing the abandonment of former principles. And yet my hon. friend from Centre Toronto rises as a new member in this House and declares upon his solemn faith that the Government has implemented every pledge made to the people. Here was a pledge, not made in a speech merely, but more strongly by a resolution moved and a Bill introduced and strongly supported by gentlemen then in opposition and now leading members of the Government of this country.

Then, Sir, what with reference to the promise of public works and subsidies? How often has that been declaimed against by good Liberals? Of course, I am not now speaking of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto, for he is a good Tory. He is Liberal-ized for the nonce, but in his heart Tory principles are strongly entrenched. He it was who came to Ottawa when the first gun of tariff change was to be fired, and sat down beside the Finance Minister and with him went over the tariff line by line, taking good care that certain manufacturers of hardware should be well protected. But Liberal-ized as he is, what has he to say to this pledge I have referred to? I appeal,

Mr. FOSTER.

no less, to my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), an honest man. I ask if for seventeen years he did not take strong ground with his confreres against the promise of public works as a means of bonusing members and their constituencies? He undoubtedly did. It does him honour. He was joined by every member of the present Ministry. Up and down this country the people were taught to believe that, when the Liberals came into power, there would be no more of these things, that no more should promises be given to members of large franchises being voted to them and great subsidies to their counties. What do I read?

I, the undersigned, declare that on several occasions during the months of March and April last, and before coming to power, Hon. Mr. Laurier, the Prime Minister, gave me the assurance and the formal guarantee that he would have voted by the Parliament of Canada in favour of the South Shore Railway Company, composed of Messrs. Hyacinthe, Beauchemin, J. M. Fortier, estate of Hon. L. Tourville, estate of Joel Leduc, F. X. Choquette and others, the subsidies in cash required for the construction of the South Shore Railway from Sorel to Chaudière Junction, near Lévis, and that the said subsidies will be voted at the present session this year at Ottawa, at least from Sorel to St. Gregoire.

R. M. S. MIGNAULT, M.P.

Yamaska, May 14, 1897.

That was read in the heat of an election contest in that same county of Yamaska, in order corruptly to influence the electorate. Sir, some excuse may be given for a Minister who may say, in looking over a section of country, Yes, I think that is a section of country which ought to be benefited in a certain way, and when I get into power, if I do, I will use my influence to have money granted for developing that portion of the country. That is one thing. It is going far, but it may be justified. But there is no justification in making a special promise to a special man, or a special company, or a special set of individuals. That is a corrupt promise, meant only to be a corrupt promise, usable only for purposes of corruption. And yet my naive and innocent friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram)—and he will be more careful before he is in this House many months—rose and in all the blush of his maiden speech, declared that the Ministers have implemented every pledge that they ever made to this country. Sir, do I need to go further with these pledges? They can be found by the score, they are all over this country, and before this session of Parliament is through, many of them will be brought to the attention of this House. These are sufficient to prove the statement that I have made. So, Sir, the First Minister himself went down to Nicolet, in the heat of a contest where a railway was really the only politics that there was before the people. Did he introduce Mr.