BOMBSHELL THROWN

To charge public men, particularly

ing and ignoring their promises and

pledges, is a serious thing and one

that ought not to be done carelessly or

lightly. To make such a carge be-

comes all the more serious when the

one making it is one who was once the

associate of these leaders, and is still

ciples he charges them with betraying.

It is, then, with a full sense of my per-

sonal responsibility and with a deep

consciousness of the gravity of the

charge I am about to make, that I

state it as my deliberately formed

opinion that the present leaders of

the liberal party, Sir Wilfrid Lau-

rier and his colleagues in the

them as were members of the liberal

party when in opposition), have be-

trayed the principles of our party, been

with the people of Canada. I repeat,

sciousness of its seriousness, and of

that, as one whose efforts, however

IN DETAIL

when asking the support of the elec-

torate. But I feel that the gravity of

the charke I make and the personal

responsibility attaching to one who un-

dertakes to publicly make such a

charge, requires that I adduce proofs

in support of the accusation. I am the

more convinced that I ought to do this,

because one of the members of the

cabinet has recently had the temerity

to claim, publicly, that every pledge

and promise made by them prior to

the last general election has been re-

As briefly as I can, and as may be

consistent with clearness, I will, then,

consider what were the main principles

and the principal pledges proclaimed

and made and how far these have been

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIA-

MENT.

One of the political principles which

has been most dear to liberals is that

members, either as a reward for sup-

session of the last parliament, the pre-

in the house, embodied the principle

acceptance of parliament. This bill

provided that no member should be

eligible for any office or position of

emolument in the gift of the crown,

one year after the dissolution of the

tive government for having taken

members from their places in parlia-

lived up to.

cabinet, (or at least such

a member of the party whose prin-

leaders of a political party,

deliberate desertion of prin-

and with hamefully break-

CAMP OF THE LIBERALS.

Laurier Government Arraigned by H. H. Cook, Ex-Liberal M. P. for East Simcoe, Who Says All Pledges Have Been Broken.

Failure to Maintain the Independence of Parliament and Reduce the Expenditure, Taxes and Debt of the Country.

Mr. H. H. Cook, who has been six times elected to the House of Commons and has long been recognized as one of the leading liberals in Ontario has issued this address to the people of Canada and especially to his fellow liberals:

VIEWS OF A LIBERAL

ciple

I claim no right and no authority to franchise and unfit for citizenship in speak for the liberal party, nor for a free community." liberals at all; but, as a life-long liberal and as one who has in the past given of his effort and his means to promote the success of the cause of the liberalism, I may, perhaps, be permitted, without arrogance, to claim a right to speak to liberals, particularly at a time when I believe that plain speaking is needed and under circumstances which render silence almost betrayal of true liberal principles. If there be any liberals who consider party success and the getting and holding of power and office the great and important thing-the only thing worth struggling for-what I am about to say is not for them. I am, on the contrary, addressing myself to those liberals and I am persuaded they constitute the vast majority of the rank and file, at any rate, of the party -who are liberals because they believe in the undying principles of liberalism, and who regard office and political power only as a means to an end, and that end the shaping of the country's policy and the moulding of its laws in accordance with those principles. I would ask these liberals whether numerous or only a saving remnant, to consider with me calmly and dispassionately the present condition of the liberal party, and also the question. What is our present duty to wards our party and our country?

TREACHERY SHOULD BE PUN-

Under our system of party government it is a strong—and the people have a right to assume—that when a party is intrusted with the reins of government it will faithfully, loyally, and to the utmost of its ability carry out the policies it advocated and fulfil the pledges it made when in opposition. It will not be disputed, by any victions of what is due to the prinhonest man at anyrate, that, if a party ciples of liberalism? fails to do this, it is guilty of downright and shameful betrayal of its principles, and becomes unworthy of the support of all honorable men. Indeed, it will hardly be held that men can any longer give their support to such a party without sharing in its shame and being guilty of condoning the offence of obtaining and retaining power and office upon false pretences. and cannot fail to know that not one For eighteen years our party was in opposition, and during those years it principle for which the party stood under the leadership of Brown, Maccriticised the policy and censured kenzie and Blake is now guiding the may not be well founded. It is to be many of the acts of the conservative present leaders of the party. Neither party then in power. During those can they fail to know that no honest eighteen years our party also, someeffort has been made to fulfil the pledtimes by platforms solemnly adopted ges and promises made by these men in conventions, and at times by the voices of its chosen and recognized leaders and representatives, enunciated policies and made certain definite promises and pledges. Just prior to the general elections in 1896 the party issued, officially, a pamphlet, in which its policy and political principles were set forth, with sufficient detail and exactness. And upon that statement of policy and declaration of principles, and upon the promises and pledges made expressly and by implication, the party asked for and obtained the support of a majority of the electorate, and the leaders of the party were given a mandate by the people to carry out the promised policy and fulfil the pledges and promises made. It is for us, as liberals, to consider whether or not the leaders of the party have been true to the trust thus and then reposed in them; whether they have honestly and honorably striver to do the things they promised and to undo those things which the previous the independence of parliament should government had done and of which we complained. If we can honestly say be sorupulously guarded. As a party they have done so, or if they have we have maintained that it is inimical fairly endeavored to fulfil their to honest legislation and fatal to all pledges, then it would be our duty and individual independence among memour pride and pleasure as well, to give bers of parliament, that the government of the day should be allowed to support. If, on the other hand, we find give or promise offices of emolument to forced to admit that no honest effort has been made to keep their port already given or as an inducepromises; if they have neither carried ment to give support in the future. Mr. Blake voiced the views of the out nor honestly tried to carry out the policy to which we as a party had party on this, and in the very last find ourselves compelled to own that sent postmaster general, with the supthe charge our opponents are making port of the representatives of the party against us, that our leaders have made of us a party of pledge breakers and in a measure which he offered for the betrayers of principle, is true, then we acceptance of parliament. This bill can only avoid sharing in the guilt and dishonor by disassociating ourselves from these leaders, by repudiating them, and by doing all that may during the existence of the parliament be in our power to oust them from the of which he was a member, or until positions which they have obtained by treason to principle. Two sentaken from the pamph- measure, Mr. Mulock indulged in let I have referred to apply strong condemnation of the conservawith striking force to us and to our duty at the present juncture. These sentences are: "Never mind how you voted twelve, eight, or four emolument. Speaking generally of the years ago; you are not the chattel of viciousness of the practice, he conany party leader, or the serf of any demned and to put an end to which "The man his measure was designed, Mr. Mulock who cannot vote against 'his party' said-See Hansard, 1896, page 2375: "If for his country is unworthy of the the government can dangle public of-

administration of the day, they become mere parasites upon the administra-tion and cease to voice the opinion of their constituents; not only that, but moving among their colleagues they become corrupting ageacies within practice to be disgraceful, and calculated to lower the tone of public life, and to fill it with office-seekers and place-hunters. All the liberal leaders should have been, for the measure was an embediment of one of the most cherished principles of liberalism. It was one of the principles to which the party was pledged, which the people had a right to expect us to stand by, and to carry out which they entrusted us with the reigns of government. How have our leaders fulfilled this promise to the electorate? MEMBERS WITH APPOINTMENTS

IN THEIR POCKETS.

During the many years that conservative party was in power, and up to the time when Mr. Mulock introduced his measure, up to the time when he and others made their stron-ly-condemnatory speeches, seventeen members of parliament had been appointed to office. During the four years the present government has been in power, thirteen members have been so appointed to offices, with salaries aggregating \$39,000 per year. So great was the indecent haste of the present premier to give the lie to his previous professions and to stultify his party on this principle of the independence of parliament, that, on the 8th July 1896, he wrote to Mr. Francois Langelier, the member for Quebec, these shameless words: "This is what I pro pose: The position of lieutenant-governor will be at our disposition at the end of 1897, and, if from now till that time you are not appointed judge, I propose to place the lieutenant-governorship at your disposal." Later, he wrote to Mr. Langelier's brother, asking him to "tell Francois that I do not wish there should be any misunderstanding; I wish that may promise may be considered sacred." Mr. Langelier sat and voted in parliament for two sessions with this promise in his pocket, "a mere parasite upon the administration," "moving about among his colleagues, a corrupting agency within their own ranks," to use the forcefully descriptive language of Mr. Mulock. At the end of that time Sir Wilfrid's "sacred promise" was fulfilled, and Mr. Langelier became a false to their pledges, and broken faith judge, with a salary of \$5,000 per year. So debasing has been the government's make this charge with a full conattitude and example in this matter that recently one of their supporters, the personal responsibility I assume in in a letter addressed to the liberal asmaking it; but I make it, believing sociation of his constituency, brazenly told them in effect that should they feeble and humble they may have been, were exerted, four years ago, tore-nominate him he would, if re-electwards putting these men in the posi- ed, look upon his seat in parliament as tions they occupy and have disgraced. a stepping-stone to an office of emolufrom sharing their ment only stip guilt by thus publicly denouncing and should carry with it "an adequate sal-repudiating them. I take this means ary." Surely Mr. Mulock was proof doing what I consider my duty be- phetic when he said that "the elector cause it affords me the opportunity to ate, noticing these things, are coming ask my fellow liberals whether they to the conclusion that the highest aim can reconcile a further support of a man can have in seeking public life men who have betrayed them and de- is that he may, through parliament, ceived the country with their own con- find his way into a comfortable position for life." And surely honest liberals ought not to forgive or refrain from punishing the false leaders who have on this question of the absolute independence of parliament lowered I might leave the subject here and ask my fellow liberals to consider the the banner of liberalism and dragged charge I have made and weigh it it in the dirt. Mr. Langelier's case is against their own knowledge of the not an isolated one; others equally political history of the dominion since discreditable might be named. It is the liberal leaders assumed office. They even charged now that there are in the are intelligent men and reading men, present parliament a number of members who have been sitting and voting with promises of judgeships and other

> with an evidently confident expectation that it will be believed? INVESTIGATIONS CHOKED OFF. Among the solemn declarations of principle made by the national liberal convention at Ottawa in June, 1893. was the following bearing upon the principle of the independence of par-

offices in their pockets. This charge

hoped that it is not. But is it not

humiliating to reflect that the con-

duct of our leaders has been such that

a charge like this, involving ineffable

disgrace to our party, can be made

"That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the house of commons to enquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct m office against ministers of the crown, and the reference of such matters to royal commissions created upon the advice of the accused is at variance with the due responsibility of ministers to the house of commons, and tends to weaken the authority of the house over the executive government, and this convention affirms that the powers of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fit ting occasions be upheld."

This was the declared belief of the liberal party then. I believe it to be the belief of all true liberals still. The making of such a declaration implied a promise to the people, which, as a party, we cannot ignore, much less repudiate, without being chargeable with falsehood and dishonor. How have our party leaders dealt with that prom-

On June 27th, 1899, Sir Hibbert Tup per, in his place in parliament, made a series of distinct charges, twenty seven in all, alleging incapacity, misconduct, corruption, and malfeasance in connection with the management of the affairs of the Yukon by the department of the interior. In a number of these charges Hon. Clifford Sifton the minister of the interior, was accused of personal wrong-doing of the gravest character, and all of the charges reflected upon his character house. Speaking in support of his and conduct, either as a man or as a minister. I shall not here discuss whether these charges were true or not. Three liberal members appear to have believed that some of them, at ment and put them in positions of any rate, were true, but this is not the question I wish to discuss. To us, as liberals, the important question is: Did our party and its leaders meet and dealt with them? Were they met and extravagant was the expenditure of power, our party would reduce the party never promised free trade. I am

nation that such charges should be, and as we had pledged our-selves to deal with such charges? Did the liberal leaders assert "the ancient and undoubted right of the house of commons to enquire into . . . all charges of misconduct in office against ministers of the crown?" On the contrary, the accused minister, backed by grant a judicial commission of enquiry, and this, although the member who brought the charge offered to abide by the result of the investigation, and, in the event of his failure and members supported Mr. Mulock, and strong speeches were made in advocacy of his measure. This was as it hold any office in the event of his right to sit in parliament, or to hold any office in the gift of the crown. notwithstanding the solemn condemnation of the practice of referring charges against ministers "to royal ons created upon the advice of the accused," the government entrusted the duty of "investigating" the charges to one of their own officials, an employe of the department he was instructed to investigate, and a relative by marriage of the accused minister. As if to make certain that even this not unfriendly investigator should not be able to make any unpleasant discoveries, such restrictions and difficulties were imposed upon him and upon those who might be called upon to give evidence that the commissioner report that his investigation was incomplete. Can we, in the face of these facts, deny that the leaders of our party, the men for whose conduct we shall rightly be held responsible unless we repudiate it, and them, have falsified the pledge given to the people to preserve and maintain the independence of parliament?

PROVISES OF RETRENCHMENT.

Perhaps the most definite and positive promise made by our party to the electorate was that the public debt should be at any rate not increased, and that the annual expenditure of the dominion should be materially reduced. This was a distinct promise; not something which might be inferred; but positively and definitely made by the convention that defined our party policy, and reasserted over and over again by our leaders. Here is the promise as made by the conven-

"We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt, and of the controllable annual expenditure of the dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the

Not to speak of statements made by other prominent and leading men of the party for whose utterances we could hardly escape responsibility, I will give a few extracts from speeches made in amplification of this promise by members of the present government prior to the last general elec-Sir Wilfrid Laurier said: "If we get

although we may not be able to bring the expenditure to what it was under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three, millions of dollars per year." Sir Louis Davies thus understood and defined the promise made by the liberal party: "The liberal party says

that several millions may be lopped off the present expenditure without injury to the public service." Hon. David Mills declared that he had "no doubt that the efficiency of the public service might be increased,

and the expenditure reduced by almost one half." Hon. William Paterson said: "We are taking \$6,115,000 more in taxes out of the people than we should, and we spend \$5,571,000 more than we should.' Sir Richard Cartwright said: "I say that it is a disgrace and a shame to the government that have been entrusted with our affairs that they

come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,000,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly uninstifiable." Hon. William Mulock was equally emphatic: "There is nothing to warrant this enormous expenditure of nearly \$38,000,000, except the fact that

with office-holders, great and small." HOW THE PLED HES WERE BROKEN.

The controllabe an iual expenditure during the last four years of the conservative administration was as fol-

78:												
1893												\$36,814,052
1894	 											37,585,025
1895	 									,		38,132,005
1896					,		•					36,949,142

an average expenditure yearly of \$37,-370,056. During the whole time they were in office the yearly expenditure averaged \$33,535,549. This was the expenditure which, by solemnly adopted resolution, we condemned. It was to this expenditure that the language I have quoted was applied. How have our promises and the pledges of our leaders been fulfilled? What we and they intended the electorate to understand was that if they placed our party in power the public expenditure should be reduced. This was our contract and agreement with them. What has happened? The controllable annual expenditure under the present government has been:

1897.....\$38,349,759 1898...... 38,232,525 1299..... 41,903,500 1900..... 43,175,000

an average of \$40,565,196 yearly, greater by \$3,195,140 than the average during the last four years of the conservative administration, or \$7,029.647 more per year than our opponents spent on an average during their eighteen years of power. The average total yearly expenditure since the liberal government came into power has been \$46,616,623; as against a yearly average under conservative rule of \$42,-335,881. That is, instead of the promised decrease of from two to five millions, there has been an increase of more than four and a quarter millions yearly.

SIR RICHARD'S EVASIONS. An attempt has been made to make

his speech, delivered in Toronto on August 24, 1899, Sir Richard Cartwright took this position, and as they have issued this speech as a campaign pamphlet (Political Pointers No. 1) the covernment may be fairly assumed to have adopted his defence. Sir Richard's defence amounts to this: The expenditure of thirty-eight or thirtyseven millions in 1896 was to great under the then existing condiwhen the liberal' party objected, and with good cause, to the great expendi-ture, I doubt if since Canada became a nation, if since the period of Confederation, there was ever a time when there was such a need for economy as there was in that year." Unfortunately for such a defence as this, the complaint of extravagant expenditure and our promises had no reference to the year 1896. The resolution I have quoted was adopted at Ottawa in 1893. The remarks of Sir Louis Davies were made in 1893. It was in 1889 that Mr Mills said that the expenditure could he cut in two without impairing the efficiency of the public service. Mr Mulock spoke in 1895, and Mr. Pater son in 1890. It simply is not true tha our complaint was because of an expenditure in any one year. What we desired the electorate to believe wa that the late government were spending several millions more per year than the necessities of the public service required, and our promise was that, if placed in power, we would, to quote the language of Mr. Charlton, "at once educe the public expanditure and effect other savings to the extent of five million dollars per annum without impairing the efficiency of the service.' Mr. Charlton spoke in 1893, and it is reasonable to suppose that a gentleman of his grasp and ability did not mistake the meaning of the declaration of the platform, nor misunderstand the promise it was meant to convey. SHAMEFUL AND DISGRACEFUL

At the time the Mackenzie govern-

ment went out of power the net debt

of the dominion was \$140,000,000. When

the late conservative government went

out of office it had risen to \$258,497,-

432. This increase we, as a party, con-

demned, "viewed it with alarm," to use the language chosen by our convention to express our attitude regarding it. It is useless for us to pretend that we did not wish and expect the electorate to believe that, if entrusted with the management of public affairs, we would at least not increase this debt, already, as we contended, too large. Such a pretence would neither deceive others nor ourselves. In the pamphlet to which I have already referred, among a number of 'Reasons why the liberal party should be entrusted with the administration of the government of Canada," is the following: "Because the liberal party again placed in power will stop the increase of the public debt and commence its reduction as quickly and as rapidly as possible." Yet in the face of this distinct and solemn promise the present government have actually increased the public debt by not less than \$6,458,000. I take the figures from the statement of Sir Richard Cartinto power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I will say that, wright. Can we, as a party, in this matter of the public debt and public expenditure our pledges and promises have been broken; shamefuly, disgracefully broken? And remember that even while admitting that the public debt has been added to, the government claim that they have been in receipt of revenues exceeding those enjoyed by their predecessors by many millions of dollars. Here again are Sir Richard Cartwright's words: "Our gross income for 1899 will be forty-six millions at least, as against thirty-four millions in 1895." So that not only have the government to confess that they have broken the party's pledge not to increase the public debt, but they have increased it despite the fact that they were in receipt and enjoyment of enormously increased revenues. How can we, as a tives is, like its prototype, a fraud and party, hope to ever again enjoy the at large if we allow our leaders to thus brazenly break our solemn pledges and promises, without rebuke at our hands? Is it to be supposed that a people so intelligent as ours will not consider this increased expenditure and added debt in the light of the charge we made against our opponents of corruption and malfeasance? Here is the charge as made by we are burdened lown with debt, and the Ottawa convention: "The convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of has existed under the rule of the conservative party." Is it to be supposed nounced protection as "nothing more that an intelligent and thoughtful people reading such a charge and then reflecting that our present leaders are expending far more public money for practically the same public service will ask themselves the question, Were these charges of corruption true?" and, if they were, must there not be either greater corruption or almost unthinkable mismanegement now? But serious as such a reflection upon either the truthfulness or honesty of our leaders is, it is trifling when compared with the charge, which can neither be denied nor explained away, that they have deliberately and flagrantly deceived the public, and broken the solemn pledges they gave for the purpose of obtaining office and power. Let me again repeat, for it cannot be too often or too strongly insisted upon, that unless we of the rank and file of the party clear ourselves of complicity in their criminality by repudiating our forsworn leaders, we must be content to be held to be consenting parties to the shameful deception which has been prac-

ticed upon the people of Canada. THE BURDEN OF TAXATION.

Along with the promise that the pubtic expenditure should be substantially reduced, and that the public debt should not be increased, another pledge was given, namely, that the burden of The taxation should be lightened. 'undue taxation of the people" was what cur platform condemned. "We are the party of low taxation," was the emphatic declaration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Mr. Mills said, "We are asking for a reduction of taxation." Sir Richard Cartwright, ever emphatic, with power, we would at once abolish declared, "These villainous customs taxes are impoverishing and ruining the premier is credited by the newsour people." All this amounted to a papers with having said, in the course government ought to have met and it appear that what was objected to as distinct pledge, that, if placed in of a recent address, that he and his



Songs of Praise

Fredericton, N.B., Dec. 15th, 1890.
Having used SWRPRISE SOAP for the past ten years, I find it the best so that I have ever had in my house at the past ten years, they when I can be a seen and the past ten be a seen to the past ten be a seen ten be a seen to the past ten be a seen to the past ten be a seen ten be a St. Thomas, Ont.

I have to wash for three brothers the
work on the railroad, and SURPRISSOAP is the only soap to use. We tric
every other kind of soap, and I tell every
body why our overalls have such a goo
color. Maudie Logan. SURPRISE is a pure hard SOAP.

burden of the taxation of the people Has this promise been fulfilled? During the last three years of conervative rule the total customs and excise duties, i. e., the taxation of the people, amounted to \$81,598,953. During the three years of liberal rule these taxes have totalled \$94,477,179, or an increase of \$12,878,226 instead of teh promised reduction. An attempt has been made to explain this increase away by saying that the population has increased in the meantime, and that the increased total receipts from customs and excise is due to this Unfortunately for this excuse, it is not borne out by the government's own official returns. In the trade and navigation returns the percentage of taxation per head of the population is figured out, and the figures show that the taxation per head has increased since the present government came into power. More than that, the figures show that, while under conservative rule, between 1892 and 1896, the taxation in proportion to population had decreased by \$1.12 per head, since teh advent of the present government instead of the promised reduction there has actually been an increase of \$1.16 per head, or \$5.80 per family. Can we, with any expectation of being believed, pretend, in the face of these facts, that our promise to reduce the burden of taxation has been fulfilled, or that any honest attempt has been made to fulfil 'it? If Hon. Mr. Paterson, who says all our pledges have been redeemed, was speaking truthfully when he said that \$6,115,000 was being needthe people must be needlessly taxed now to the tune of \$13,077,324 annually. Unless he was then engaged in an attempt to deceive the people, the expenditure which he said was too great by \$7,571,000 then is \$16,583,635 too great

THE TARIFF PLEDGES. The protective tariff and the whole system and principle of protection was denounced in our platform, and we rositively pledged ourselves to repeal it. Upon no question were our leaders, the members of the present government, more clear and emphatic than on this. At the Ottawa convention, Sir Wilfrid Laurier declared: "The servile copy of the American system brought amongst us by the conservaa robbery, and I call upon you, one confidence and respect of the people and all, to pronounce at once, and give your emphatic support to the proposition that we shall never rest until we have wiped away from our system that fraud and robbery under which Canadians suffer." On another occasion he said: "I will not be satisfied until the last vestige of protection has been removed from the soil of Canada. Our great reform is to put away from the soil of Canada the last vestige of protection." Once again he said: "Call it protection, call it feudalism, call it slavery, I care not, it is the same thing. public moneys which for years past It differs only in degree, it is bondage." Sir Richard Cartwright denor less than a deliberate, legalized and organized robbery," and "the very highroad to political slavery first, and industrial slavery afterwards." policy from first to last," Sir Richard declared, "has been to destroy the villainous system of protection by free trade, a revenue aciff, or continental free trade." Speaking at the Ottawa convention, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said: "We will relieve the people of protection, which is a fraud, a delusion, and a robbery," and again: "Let it be well understood then that from this moment we have a distinct issue with the party in power. Their ideal is protection; our ideal is free trade; their immediate object is protection; ours a tariff for revenue and for revenue only Upon this issue we engage in battle. In the platform of principles adopted at Ottawa are these words: "We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people." On that platform, as in the words of Sir Wilfrld

> the two parties is declared to be "clearly defined," and our tariff plank ends with this solemn, definite, clear-cut declaration: "This issue was unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada." Pages of the official pamphlet to which I have referred are filled with arguments in favor of free trade, and in opposition to protection. But I need not dwell longer upon this. No liberal who cares to preserve a decent reputation for candor and truthfulness will attempt to deny that our party, when appealing for the support of the electorate made a solemn promise that, if entrusted the system of protection. I notice that

> Laurier last quoted, the issue between

have taken care th remain sufficiently rle protection to Ca Did any conservati fer or promise mo Macdonald, in 1861, policy of "ample dian industries?" "I say that the gr tariff as it exists unchanged. We sl terations as it ma they are needed. whole will stay as am not quarrelling blaming him. Not was not bound by pledges. He had them and his repud and declaration of principle of protect treachery nor dish pledges have to dea Mr. Tarte's states been repudiated no ministerial colleage our party, and we government and the thus become respon Mr. Sifton, too, ha leagues and the pa Here are his word question that is set dead issue, becaus succeeded in solving

rted with abs

not for the under

A CONTEMPTIE

No statements co

promises more explication ones on the

with shame and h

confess that they ha

nd brought down

for tariff changes, be something like

est intention to car ises so solemnly ma

was withdrawn an

ted, in which there

est evidence of any

to depart from the

which had been

tral idea of the te

conservative minist

attempt to "put aw

Canada the last

tion." as Sir Wilfr

loudly promised to

from being an eff

people of protection

Tarte felt himself j

the protected m.

"while the presen

found itself oblig

changes for the sa anomalies, and for

tion, and the tariff

opponents, if they

not change very mu iating, what a con are we thus placed If we advance in the

trade we break

Messrs. Tarte and

make; if we do not to all the past pro

I know that

EVIDENCE OF

of our party.

ister made his

not like to believe

could be guilty of an

ce of his audien

made to make it a has been amended free trade, and William Paterson. bottdness to claim have been fulfille statement more in than homesty. Unfi returns, which are tradict it flatly. that the percentag upon goods enter sumption is only than it was when was in power, and ance were made which appears in ported free for while a great par abroad. the entir less than one per o to examine the tar dence of treacher; becomes yet more mised free agric the duty remains mised free coal (the duty one cer promised free cot grey cotton has be per cent. to 35 per 30 to 35 per cent., ton from 121-2 to simply idle to pre promises have been honest or serious made to keep the let me say that our pledge-breaking assisting to bring nunishment, can of the party, avoid tion in their flagra political decency.

> Just before the speaking for the right to de, Sir W a distinct statem ing to the securin ential trade between Britain. He dec was ripe to obtain Chamberlain had sion that the tim it was possible fo give to the coloni their products ov other nations. Sin emn promise that then approaching "send commission range for a ba trade." How has kept? Has any

SIR WILFRID

BRE



made to redeem