

that agitators were sent through the country, and the leader of the Opposition opened the ball in London, afterwards proceeding to Hamilton and Toronto. When I heard that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was going to address a mass meeting, as it was called, in Hamilton, for the purpose of laying this matter of the Syndicate before it, my colleague and I dropped a note to the hon. gentleman asking him if he had any objection to discuss the question on this occasion, with another gentleman, in order that the people might have an opportunity of hearing both sides. I received a courteous reply informing me in so many words that he did not think it could be done; however, he would leave the matter to the committee which had invited him to speak, and if they were desirous it should be so he would place himself in their hands. He also intimated that a copy of our note, with his answer, had been sent to the committee. You may be sure that the gentlemen in Hamilton could not see their way to such an arrangement, and the consequence was there was no discussion. I am not one to suggest for a moment that the member for West Durham is afraid to meet any man. I presume he thinks there is no man in this House who is worthy of his steel. He informed me that my hon. and esteemed friend from South Wentworth was to be one of the speakers at that meeting, with the view, no doubt, of assisting to convert the unrighteous to repentance, and make all the citizens of Hamilton good followers of the hon. member for West Durham. The meeting took place, and a large meeting it was. There was no one there to represent the other side, for the reason that none would be admitted, although I begged to be allowed to, and that the hon. Minister of Railways might be allowed to attend. I felt the hon. member for West Durham might turn up his nose if I were to be his opponent, so I informed him that the hon. Minister of Railways had expressed his willingness to attend; but that made no difference. One would have supposed that when the hon. gentleman had it all his own way, when the Music Hall in Hamilton was packed, his eloquence and powers of persuasion would have been sufficient to convert the whole city, and petitions would have been sent from every quarter of it praying this House not to pass this measure. But not a petition has been sent. Not the slightest excitement took place and the hon. gentleman made nothing by his motion. His speech was talked of certainly for a couple of days later. He was said to be a most magnificent speaker, well known to be a very able lawyer and special pleader, who presented his case in a way that must have carried conviction had there been truth or force in the arguments he used, or had the people no common sense; but the people of Hamilton have common sense, they read the papers, they reason for themselves and will not allow the eloquence of the hon. member for West Durham nor his legal skill to carry them away, against their better judgment. The meeting resulted in nothing, and my colleague and myself are plied with letters asking when this cruel war will be over, when the contract will be ratified. All want to see the question settled, and settled exactly as the Government have agreed with the Syndicate. In saying, as I did, that nothing came of the meeting, I was not literally correct. One of the grievances the hon. gentleman presented to the people of Hamilton was this fact, that the Syndicate would hold their lands back and create a land monopoly, taking advantage of the Government settlers, who would increase the value of their lands. Somebody suggested that would not be altogether an unmixt evil, for the settlers could then use the Company's lands for the purpose of grazing their cattle; but the hon. gentleman, quick as thought, said the Syndicate would fence in their lands, and then a calculation was entered into to show how many miles of fencing and how many thousand tons of nails they would use, and how many post holes would have to be made. The question arose whether these

post holes should come in free of duty, because it was suggested the Northern Railway would be defunct and might transfer their post holes to the Syndicate. More than this came out of the discussion. It was suggested that a monument should be erected to the memory of the hon. member for West Durham. All men, no matter how clever they may be, must some day die; but this monument was to be erected on the political death of the hon. member, which it was predicted would take place about the year 1883. It was suggested a magnificent statue should be erected to his political memory, in the middle of a 640 acres square, to be surrounded by a magnificent pine board fence, with post holes imported from the Northern Pacific Railway; that the monument should be in marble, that from the shoulders of the figure the mantle of Aurora should be slipping off—and in parenthesis permit me to say that that mantle is very thin—that in his left hand he would hold a scroll, said to be the refused offer of the new Syndicate; and that a phantom cow from West Elgin would appear looking most wistfully at the grass, while in the right hand of the figure would be a placard bearing the warning: "Keep off the grass."

Mr. HUNTINGTON. I have been a listener during a considerable part of this long debate, at which it was not my good fortune to have been present all the time. I have been pleased with the ability which has been displayed in the discussion of this great question on both sides of the House. I have not, myself, taken part in the debate, because a great portion of the time I was not here, and when here I contented myself by my pride in the ability with which my colleagues on this side have discussed the question, and I registered my views by my votes. I would have been better pleased if, since we seem on the whole to have got on in this debate with good nature, the special orators of the Government side had not been set up, just now, to call us all the bad names with which they seem to be familiar. The hon. member for Niagara and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries agreed in this particular, though they may differ in some things. The hon. member for Niagara is, I think, not so genial, not so gracious, not so gifted, shall I say, as the hon. gentleman who has dwelt down by the sea all his life in a softer atmosphere, and who has probably enjoyed the advantages of better society than the hon. member for Niagara, who betrays the cold frigid latitude from which he comes. I say nothing of the want of courtesy which he sometimes displays, for, unlike the hon. member for Queens, he has not enjoyed the refining effects of learning and good society, and all the genial influences which culture can confer upon a man. But in all other respects these two hon. gentlemen whose names began with a particular letter are as like as two peas. They have a common contempt for the Opposition. They both regard the gentlemen on this side of the House as no gentlemen, indeed there are none on this side or in our party; the party of gentlemen in which the hon. member for Niagara is so distinguished a light sit altogether on the other side of the House. I do not, Sir, dispute that the gentlemen over there are gentlemen; but I do dispute that the men of learning and culture, the men who deserve the respect of this House are the men who rise and indulge in such wholesale denunciations of a great party as the hon. gentleman did to-day. Does he want the country to believe that he is so far removed from that wisdom which should distinguish a member of Parliament—does he wish them to believe that he is honest when he rises in his place and expresses contempt for the abilities of all the men who sit on this side of the House? Does he want the country to believe that he is honest when he expresses his contempt for the whole Reform party and for the men who have led that party for years in this House? On the other hand—for the hon. gentleman must take one horn of the dilemma or the other—does the hon. gentleman wish himself to be registered as a man who knows nothing of the history of