

him some very cold morning and say to him : Good morning, it is a very cold morning, he would not say "yes" or "no," but would say : Well, I think we will have to be guided by the reading of the thermometer. He would be very careful not to commit himself.

Now I proceed to another branch of the subject. It is brought out by the assertion of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) that the Ministry have fulfilled all the pledges they ever gave. That was his statement. Now, the hon. member for Centre Toronto is tolerably past the years of youth. He is not an old man, but old enough to know the importance of the statement that he makes. Had he really looked into the matter, had he read the pledges, and had he come to the conclusion that he could stand in the face of the House of Commons—not on a hustings platform—and make the statement that the Ministry had fulfilled every pledge they had made? I am afraid my hon. friend will have to revise that position. Let us see one of the pledges that the Ministry made. Here, I may say that pledges can be made in two ways by a party in opposition. They can be made by the trend and meaning of statements impressed generally upon the people, or they can be made, in so many definite words, clearly declaring for certain things. In both those respects, the gentlemen who to-day are governing this country have made pledges, over and over, to the people which they have not pretended to implement and which they do not propose to implement. Why, what shall we think of the position taken by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and the later position taken by this Government of which he is such a distinguished, clear-headed member.

My hon. friend, when he was a member of the Opposition, fought hard and long, he observed widely and keenly, and came to the conclusion that one of the most dangerous elements in the political life of to-day was this facility with which governments could modify or control the actions of the members who supported them, by dangling offices before their eyes. I am not going to say he was wrong; but if he was right then, what business has he to sit in the Government which violates that principle to-day? No reason except that of preferment and emolument. If a man believes as a cardinal principle that it is corrupting and debasing to the politics of this country that members shall sit behind the Government with promises of offices in their pockets, he has no business to remain in a Government which does that thing. Are his words not fresh before the members of this House :

Sir, if the Government of the day can dangle public offices before their followers, and induce a few, and perhaps an increasing number, to aspire to these positions, instead of representing their constituencies here and exercising an un-

biased judgment and a wholesome influence upon the Administration of the day, they become mere parasites upon the Administration and cease to voice the opinions of their constituents. Not only do they do that, but moving among their colleagues, they become, as it were, corrupting agencies among their own ranks. And so, a small percentage of persons in that position are likely to impair the independence of the whole body. So it has become, in my opinion, a crying abuse, and Parliament is cast down from its high position. And not only is the will of the people being interfered with, not only is Parliament being subordinated to the Administration, but there is even a worse evil growing out of this abuse. All through the country the electorate, noticing these things, are coming to the conclusion that the highest aim a man can have in seeking public life is that he may, through Parliament, find his way to a comfortable position for life. If that becomes the highest aim of those who seek public life, then public life becomes a means, not of advantage to the public but of private gain. And thus we shall have coming into public life office seekers, place-hunters, instead of those ready to make sacrifices for the love of their country, and ready to undertake the labours of public life for the good they can do in the interest of the people. So that whether we view this evil with regard to its influence on the existing House, or with regard to its demoralizing influence upon public opinion, in either case, I submit, it is of such pernicious character as to demand the earliest interference on the part of this Parliament.

He introduced a Bill, and in advocacy of that Bill said :

How can a member of this House, who has the promise from the Government of a position of emolument be free to vote or take a stand as a representative of the people against the will of the Government? However independent he may desire to be, that relation entirely destroys his usefulness as a representative of the constituency which sent him here.

Men will come here not to serve the country generally, but the government of the day, in order that they themselves may profit and the interests of their constituents will only take a very secondary position.

I ask my hon. friend : If that were true then, if those words were the outcome of an honest heart and a firm conviction that public policy should be moulded upon the sentiments then expressed, why does he remain in a Government which for eighteen months has violated every canon that he laid down and has practically reduced men in this House to a condition of vassalage by raising an expectancy of office yet to come? Sir, there sat over yonder, during one or two sessions of this House, a gentleman, the law partner, I believe, of the leader of this Government. And it was common report all through this city, and that from the best of sources, that a judgeship was his, and it only required the time that was necessary in order to make that arrangement before he should take his seat upon the bench. How comes it, Sir, that Mr. François Langelier sat in that seat over yonder, at variance with his party's management, from top to bottom, at variance upon pub-