

himself and his colleagues from violating what he declared to be one of the certain and absolute principles of good conduct of any Government. Who does not remember when my hon. friend called up his logic, and warmed that logic with all the intense fervour that belongs to him, morally, mentally and physically, and launched upon this House what I myself on the other side at that time felt was a blow that I could not dodge, namely, that no person should be eligible to be appointed to any office in the service of the Government while he was a member of the House of Commons, or, at least, until one year had elapsed since the dissolution of the Parliament of which he was a member. My hon. friend made a declaration of virtue which he and his colleagues have shown by their acts that they cannot live up to to-day. What is the law for? It is to help men to be virtuous, and my hon. friend should have lost no time in introducing into this House, as a prominent member of an all-powerful Government, a Bill to prevent these hon. gentlemen from falling into that temptation to which they are yielding almost every day of the session.

We might have expected to see several other Bills—for instance, one Bill for diminishing the number of Cabinet Ministers and reducing their salaries; for that was a principle very strongly laid down by my kind and amiable friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). We miss his eloquence. We miss his resounding voice raised against all sorts of abuses, and we have a lively recollection of the supreme moral and political height to which he rose in denouncing the iniquity of having thirteen or fourteen full-fledged Ministers in the Dominion Cabinet at a salary of \$7,000 each. My hon. friend, who has lapsed on the line of the appointment of members of the House of Commons to office, was a good second to the hon. member for North Wellington. He stood at his back manfully. He held that \$4,000 was quite sufficient—\$7,000 was quite too much. We would have expected that a Bill would have been introduced to satisfy my hon. friend from North Wellington and my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock).

Then, who has forgotten that up there in Rideau Hall sits a man from Great Britain, who toils not, neither does he spin, but who every year takes so many thousand dollars of taxes which the poor patrons and the hard-working farmers of this country, especially those in my hon. friend's own constituency, have to toil and sweat and delve in order hardly to pay? And yet my hon. friend in the full flush of his great powers as a Cabinet Minister, one of the most important in a business Cabinet, fails to do his duty; and, through all last session, and so far this session, has not brought in a Bill to reduce the Governor General's salary. Why not?

Mr. FOSTER.

We might have expected this, and more, but hon. gentlemen have not brought down these measures. We shall expect them next session. On account of the lateness of the time we met this session, and the demands of this Jubilee year, we shall excuse the hon. gentlemen this session, if they do not bring in these Bills; but next year we intend to demand them.

But the hon. gentlemen have given notice of some Bills which they intend to bring down. They have brought down a Superannuation Bill, and placed it first on their docket; but it turns out that it does not abolish superannuation. That is a Bill which they might very well bring in on commencing their term; and we would give them every facility to carry it through, and attempt to make as good a Bill of it as possible, if it is possible with the Bill they have. Then, there is a Bill for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway. Nobody would have any objection to a Bill for the prosecution of a great public work like that. There is another question very much vexed, especially for my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), and very much vexed for the paternal "Globe," which has taken this young member under its care and administration to him a very severe castigation—on its knee, speaking metaphorically—to which the hon. gentleman objects; and he is to-day sending back his remonstrance in no mild terms. Then, there is the Fast Line Service, which is a matter of important public policy. Nobody could have objected if that measure were put at or near the fore-front of this session's legislation. Where it is, we do not know. We do know where Mr. Dobell—I forget his constituency—is. That is a measure which I suppose will be brought before us as soon as he returns. Then there is the prohibition plebiscite.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. We certainly wish to hold the Government to its pledge. I have evidently struck a sympathetic chord in the heart of my hon. friend from King's.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You have struck oil.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew I should do so, and I am glad to give him pleasure in that slight way. It is not quite as satisfactory as it might be, but that is the best which I, as a cold water man, can do for him. I shall expect the First Minister to bring that Bill down and to pass it in good faith, as he has pledged the country that he will do.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have heard of pledges before.

Mr. FOSTER. So have I.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have also heard of moments of weakness.

Mr. FOSTER. I have heard not only of moments of weakness, because, I suppose,