

THE MONTREAL Daily Star

GIVES REASONS WHY

GEO. E. FOSTER

===== SHOULD BE =====

DEFEATED

MR. FOSTER is a political out-cast from New Brunswick ; he has been defeated in one Ontario Constituency, is he good enough for North Toronto ?

Mr. Foster is charging the government with the mismanagement of land sales in the West ; will Mr. Foster please explain his private gains resulting from unwarranted speculation in western land with money held in trust for the widows and orphans of the Independent Foresters ?

Why has Mr. Foster not accompanied Mr. Borden on his recent tour ?

Mr. Borden should be careful ; was not Sir MacKenzie Bowell the victim of a " nest of traitors " for less cause ?

Read what the Montreal Daily Star "Conservative paper," has said about the Conservative Candidate in North Toronto.

The Montreal Daily Star discussing Mr. Foster and his connection with Trust funds says on April 11, 1907 :—
When he comes to deal with the case of the Great West Land Company it is impossible to escape the feeling that he would have been better advised if he had admitted frankly that he made a mistake. No amount of challenges to all and sundry to put their fingers on any illegal step in the whole business will make these listening to him believe that a man should act in the dual capacity of leading director of a Trust Company, which is risking the money, and a member of a speculative land syndicate which is borrowing that money—there being a startling similarity between the syndicate and the directorate. **For a man to consent to occupy such a position—even if the**

transaction to which he lends himself be as white as snow—is to show that he holds a low standard of what is required of a public man, and a man in a position of trust. Mr. Foster, for example, might be able to argue that he could act for a company having a claim against the Government and as Finance Minister at the same time. . . .

To attempt to evade the moral responsibility involved in the investment of insurance funds under such circumstances is about as convincing as the contention that a thief's money may be knowingly taken by a church on the ground that the material coins do not carry the "taint" of crime.

**Montreal Daily Star, August 26th,
1907**

What would happen to Mr. Foster if an "old time Liberal picked him out" and ask him to restate former

utterances on economy and integrity and then requested him to say if handling of Union Trust funds were in consonance with those teachings; or if Mr. Foster's present day prosperity is due to his precept or example?

**Montreal Daily Star, August 13th,
1907**

Mr. R. L. Borden is about to begin a tour of the country, starting, as is particularly fitting in his case, at Halifax. Naturally he will call to his assistance the more prominent of his followers, as is customary with party leaders engaged in such enterprises. It is hoped however, that he will not forget that the selection rests with himself; and that this is an opportunity for him to show the country the measure of confidence he places in the men who sit beside and behind him. For the presence of these men in Parliament, the electors are responsible; but for their presence on Mr. Borden's platform, Mr. Borden is responsible.

There are several gentlemen of the Opposition who might be named who should be conspicuous by their absence; and Mr. Borden's courage in passing them over will augment the confidence felt in him by the people. Thus two members whom Mr. Borden should certainly leave at home are Hon. Mr. Foster of Toronto, and Mr. Fowler of New Brunswick. In the former, the people have lost their confidence; and the latter has no business to go before a popular audience as the representative of a great party until he makes good his insinuations uttered on the floor of Parliament.

PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE PURGED

**Montreal Daily Star, September
23rd, 1908**

The Liberal press is constantly asking why Mr. Foster does not accompany Mr. Borden on his tour. We are even told that Mr. Foster, who is

the Conservative candidate for one of the Toronto constituencies, will not appear with his leader at the big Toronto meeting. To these questions, neither Mr. Borden nor Mr. Foster offer any reply. But it is surely to Mr. Borden's credit—if this divorce be of his making—that he declines to preach his policy of purity from a platform upon which sits, ready to speak after him, the man who, as manager of a trust company, poured the funds in his keeping—"the trust funds of the widow and the orphan"—into a speculation for his own personal profit.

NO DEFENCE FOR FOSTER

**Montreal Daily Star, September
24th, 1908**

Neither Sir Wilfred nor Mr. Borden is suspected of the remotest sympathy with the sort of conduct for which their henchmen are pilloried. Mr. Borden, in fact, betrayed this feeling last night in the very speech in which he rushed to the defence of his absent

lieutenant. He made open boast of the fact that the Insurance Commission had ignominiously failed to connect the name of "R. L. Borden" with "any land deals." This tells us more emphatically that any definite declaration could do, what Mr. Borden really thinks of men whom this Insurance Commission did succeed in connecting with "land deals." If it would have been a disgrace for "R. L. Borden" to have been mixed up with these land deals which the searchlight of the commission revealed, what is to be said of Mr. Foster, who went into one of the most gigantic of these "deals" with the money of his trust company in his hands? What, further, is to be said of other members of Mr. Borden's entourage, who initiated this "deal" by getting special inside information from two railway magnates whose companies are constantly soliciting Parliament for legislation?