

when he reflects upon the monstrous fact, now patent, and rendered patent by this Government to the whole country, that from the day they came into power they were corrupting the members of this House by an illegal use of public money; that, from the hour they obtained power, so actively did they use their power for the corrupt and improper expenditure of the public money, in violation of the independence of Parliament, that before this House had ever met—before the present Parliament had ever met—they had rendered incapable of sitting here, except in violation of the law, a large number of members; that more than one Minister of the Crown had been by his own act rendered incapable of sitting in this House. Yet these are the gentlemen that talk about adhesion to principle. I say that was a principle that was worthy of enunciation by statesmen, and worthy of the acceptance of this Parliament. It was accepted by the passage of a law so stringent that we trusted it would render it impossible for any gentleman to accept the slightest amount of public money from any Government, under any circumstances, without voiding his seat. Yet, as I say, one gentleman walked out of this House admitted and proved to have been the recipient of \$42,000 under a contract received from these hon. gentlemen while a member of this House; a contract negotiated by the hon. member himself in connection with the Public Works Department; a contract given, not only in violation of the law, but a contract given without public tender; a contract given over a lower tender, a lower offer, made for the performance of the same service. Yet the Hon. Postmaster General dares to stand up in the face of this intelligent Parliament, this House of Commons, and say to us that they have paid the slightest attention or regard to the principles that they have propounded. I challenge them again, as I did at the outset, to name to me one single public principle that for long years they fought and contended for on the floor of this House, that they have not shown that principle to be not held as a public principle should be held by public men, from the conviction of its

importance, but a principle propounded to deceive the public in order to obtain positions that they have dishonoured after they had obtained them. Well, Sir, what about local governments? Does the hon. member not remember that the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) with the hon. the Minister of Public Works, both, on many occasions, in Parliament and out of Parliament, maintained the gross impropriety of connection or alliance between a local government and the Government of this Dominion? Does the hon. gentleman forget that that was one of the greatest principles that they propounded? Sir, I shall show, before I sit down, that this Government has not only used, but it has abused the patronage of the Crown in forming an alliance, and in acting in conjunction with the Local Government; that there is no principle that they have shown a more utter, open and thorough disregard of since they have obtained power, than in reference to this very question. Then the hon. gentleman talks about electoral corruption. I venture to say, in the face of the history of Canada for four years, in the face of the records of the courts of this country for four years that are covered with the evidences of the enormous and gigantic electoral corruption of the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, and around them, their supporters,—I say, in the face of evidence the most strong and the most damning that ever stood on public record in reference to the career of a great party,—that their whole system has been one of gigantic corruption. Why, the Minister of Public Works on a recent occasion said: "Supposing that Mr. Cook did spend \$30,000 of money, it was his own." What difference does that make? Does it matter that the money was his own? Is that what they mean by electoral purity? Does it matter whether he spent his own money or whether he spent the money subscribed by political friends for the purpose of aiding him in his election? When we find that the man branded by the decision of the courts as the most corrupt man in Canada—when we find men, with the strongest condemnation out of the mouths of the