

the Nationalist party in Quebec under Henri Bourassa upon their avowed policy of non-participation in the wars of the Empire to endeavour to procure the defeat of the Liberal administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and

Whereas, following the success of this unholy alliance Sir Robert Borden publicly recognized and included in his Cabinet men selected by Henri Bourassa, Armand Lavergne, and their associates, and,

Whereas, this alliance helps to explain the weak and vacillating policy of the Government in connection with the war, and

Whereas, Sir Robert Borden still retains in his Cabinet two intense Nationalists, Blondin, the most rabid of them all, and Patenaude, a former Nationalist organizer,

Be it therefore resolved, that we, the Liberals of Ontario, in our annual meeting assembled, desire most emphatically to condemn the continuance in this trying time of war, of this unholy Conservative-Nationalist alliance, as unfair to Canada and inimical to the best interests of the Empire.

Thus spoke the hon. member for Durham in November, 1916. Less than a year later he had become a follower of the Sir Robert Borden whom he had so vehemently condemned, and a Cabinet colleague of the Mr. Blondin whom he had so roundly denounced. And following all this he had the impudent hardihood to pretend in his North Bay speech that it was only the Conservatives of Quebec who were in alliance with the Nationalists. That statement, viewed in the light of the facts which preceded it, furnishes another illuminating example of the hon. gentleman's standard of political morality.

Having gone into the realm of fiction for his facts, it is not surprising that in the further course of his North Bay speech, the hon. member for Durham made some extraordinary statements about patronage. In effect, the hon. gentleman said that patronage had been abolished, and just about the time that he made that statement he had sent as his agent to the city of London, Col. F. H. Deacon, who, as the representative of the minister, offered to a prominent Liberal of that city, as a bribe to induce him to desert the Liberal candidate, the chairmanship of the War Purchasing Commission, formerly held by Sir Edward Kemp. In view of the urgency of the matter Col. Deacon reported the result of his interview at London by telegraph to the minister. That telegram was written by Deacon in the presence of three leading citizens of London, and I am informed that telegram is still preserved. Deacon's offer was rejected, but Deacon's agency was established by written proof furnished by Deacon himself.

The mention of the mere outlines of this one transaction discloses the peculiar view [Mr. Murphy.]

the hon. member for Durham entertains of patronage. But, brief as has been the hon. gentleman's career in Dominion politics, this incident does not by any means stand alone. Hard on its heels, the hon. member for Durham deputed Mr. G. G. S. Lindsey of Toronto to interview sundry Liberals and ascertain if they thought the public would stand the appointment of one of the members of the present Government to a place on the Ontario Supreme Court bench. Possibly the hon. gentleman may not regard that as an exercise of patronage. If he does not, then he will certainly not regard the sending of Mr. J. F. Mackay to eastern Ontario to urge Liberal candidates to desert their leader by pointing out the advantages by which their treachery would be rewarded, as an exercise of patronage.

But, whatever his view may be of the authority that he deputed in the two latter cases, there can be no doubt about the exercise of patronage in the case of Mr. Robert A. Mulholland, who was bribed to make way for the hon. gentleman as a candidate in the county of Durham, by the promise of a seat in the Senate. That bribe has been paid within the last week by Mr. Mulholland's appointment to the Senate. Realizing that the appointment would shatter the last remaining pretense that patronage had been abolished, the Government adopted the unusual course of handing out an official statement of the reasons for Mr. Mulholland's appointment. The official reasons were an official lie, which stirred the honest indignation of The Toronto Telegram, and that paper, in its issue of March 14, thus deals with the incident:

Partysim a better Pay Boss than patriotism.

A patriot gives up the best years of his life to secure liberty for the world. A partisan gives up a parliamentary nomination in Durham county to secure a seat in the House of Commons for Hon. Wesley Rowell.

The patriot's reward is the probability of death or wounds and the certainty of sacrifice, all for \$1.10 per day.

The partisan's reward is a seat in the Senate of Canada with a capitalized value of \$50,000, and an earning power of \$2,500 per annum.

In the same issue, The Toronto Telegram, after detailing the case of a Canadian Pacific Railway engineer who was earning a good salary, and who enlisted and went to the front, was wounded and had both his legs amputated, thus proceeds:

Brave names fill the muster roll of Canada's soldiers. The C.P.R. engine driver is not singled out as an unusual example of sacrifice. The maimed figure of that C.P.R. engine driver, with his ringing laughter, his bright smile and unconquered spirit, represents one form of patriotic service.