

of the electorate that they richly deserve. But there is one class of the community who to-day are anxious to pass their sentence upon this government, and that is the great moral class of this country, the men who believe that whether or not these 14 or 15 gentlemen should receive their \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year, they do believe that the rising generation of this country should be taught that the men who make pledges in public life should respect them as much as if they were made in private life. They believe that the men who carry on their election contests on the principle that might should prevail and not right, are not the men who can be held up as models for the younger part of this community. When the blackened record of these men is looked over, when the infamies they have perpetrated in every riding in the province of Ontario are considered, when they have seen, as they have seen in my own riding, a minister of the Crown side by side and face to face with a confirmed scoundrel, they will think either that the minister is low down or that the scoundrel is away up. There has not been a constituency that these hon. gentlemen have gone into, whether it was West Huron, or Cornwall, or East Simcoe, where they dare go back and repeat their notorious practices, and there is not a constituency in the whole province of Ontario where honest Liberals do not blush to-day for the infamies that have been perpetrated by these men to endeavour to keep themselves in power, and trying to stem the tide of popular disapproval that is fast setting in against them.

Mr. VALENTINE RATZ (North Middlesex). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and I must say that I think he has adopted the very wise course of refraining to place himself on record as a prophet, or the son of a prophet, in regard to the results of the general elections. I think every member on this side of the House and every member of the Liberal party outside of it is quite willing to abide by the result of the next election, and quite confident of what that result will be. Now, the hon. gentleman has found some fault with the ministers who were sent by this government to Washington to discuss trade questions with the United States government, and he has found some fault with their bill for cab-hire. I am not going to say whether that expenditure was proper or not, but it seems to have been only an ordinary item of expenditure that has been incurred by members of both governments when they were in power. I will just remind the hon. gentleman of a similar expenditure which occurred in June, 1896, when the leader of the opposition, with one of his colleagues, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), not only rode in a private car when they came to the town of

Exeter, in North Middlesex, but they did not find that private car sufficiently spacious, and so they engaged a special train in which they steamed up to Exeter. There they delivered their orations, and after they got through they steamed to the town of Strathroy, and after they got through there they returned to the city of London. Now, I would ask any member of this House, or any elector of this country, whether they deem that a proper expenditure for the country to pay. I do not object to an expenditure for cab-hire or for a private car by members of the government when they are on an official trip; but I am opposed to either ministers or servants travelling in private cars unless they travel in their official capacity.

The hon. member who has just spoken, referred to the action of the Postmaster General cutting down the wages of the mail carriers. He stated that some of the mail carriers were paid the meagre salary of \$1.08 or \$1.10 for carrying the mail 32 miles. That may be a very small amount for the work done, but I can only say that these contracts were let by public tender. If the Postmaster General had gone to work and granted twice that sum, what would hon. gentlemen opposite have said? We know that they are always claiming that all these public works should be let by tender. That has been done, and the lowest tender has been accepted. Now, I think the hon. gentleman should not find fault with the departments in that respect. We all know that the late government let mail contracts that ran from year to year. Some time ago letters were read in this House relating to contracts in the constituency of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRiviere), where tenders had been invited. After the tenders had been sent in, the previous contractor went to the member of that constituency and asked him to write to the Postmaster General to have his contract renewed. The hon. member wrote a letter to the Post Office Department and the contract was renewed, without the tenders having been opened. After the change of government and the present Postmaster General took hold of the department, the tenders were opened up, and what was the result? It was found that tenders had been sent in that were actually \$100 lower than the sum at which the contract was renewed. That letter was read while the hon. member for Provencher was in his seat, and he could not deny a single word of it.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have had a good deal to say in condemnation of the financial policy of this government, but I have not so far heard a single word or argument from them that in any way controverted the masterly statement made by the Minister of Finance. We know that not very long ago the leader of the opposition made a statement from his seat in this