

States and sacrifice of Canada for the States. He represents the volunteers of Canada as a set of laughable young men, badly clothed, and praising themselves without any reason for glory that they did not win; and he gives of this country a description that is far from flattering. He says to the Americans that our people do not recognize their duties as good neighbours. He tries to foment bad sentiments between the two countries, and he winds up with this remarkable sentence "the masses in Canada are not remarkable for intelligence." It is not only the masses in Canada who are not remarkable for their intelligence. He wrote something else once. He said: "With a French Catholic leader, and under the manipulation of such unscrupulous politicians as J. D. Edgar, I have not the greatest confidence in the immediate future of the Reform party." With such allies as the hon. preacher—I beg pardon, I mean the hon. member—with allies who sacrifice the interests they have sworn to protect for the interests of American lumbermen, with allies who despise the whole Canadian people, with allies who despise their own chief, hon. gentlemen opposite may introduce hundreds of Bills of morality but they will never have a chance of reaching office.

Mr. TISDALE. I cannot allow this debate to close, after the shape it has taken, without offering a few remarks. I had hoped that the hon. member for North Norfolk who represents, in the Liberal interest, a part of the county from which I come and in which I was born, would have allowed the episode that has been discussed to-day to have remained in oblivion. It would have been wise for him and well for Canada had he done so. The conduct of the hon. gentleman has met the condemnation, not only of the Conservative party, but of the best elements of the Liberal party. It has met the condemnation of the better portion of the press of the Liberal party. I had hoped to be able to keep silent on this question, but after listening to the debate, my duty to my native county compels me, as its representative and a Canadian, to rise in my place and give expression to my opinion in this matter. Until to-day nothing would have convinced me that the hon. gentleman would not have allowed the mistake he made—to use a mild expression—to lie in oblivion and be forgotten. Representing one-half of that county, the other half of which is represented by the hon. gentleman, and that county, which, in its early days, was peopled by the fathers of this country—the U. E. Loyalists—I preferred to accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman and allow oblivion to cover the mistake which he made. But now that he voluntarily, and not only voluntarily, but aggressively brings the matter up, and invites the expression of

Mr. AMYOT.

our opinion, the case is different. I am quite willing to agree, as I have frequently stated outside the House, that in the Reform party there are men as sincerely loyal, as willing to defend the institutions of their country, as can be found any where, and I feel all the more pained to have to rise here and break the silence I have hitherto maintained. But I feel that did I not rise now to express my view of the part the hon. gentleman has played, the charges could be brought against me that I had no reply to make. Now, in case the House may not have noticed it, I think it proper to call attention to this point. In my early parliamentary experience, whether from proper forbearance or from unwise diffidence in expressing my views, I did not speak aggressively in opposition to the hon. gentleman, feeling that, as our county of Norfolk was divided between one Liberal and one Conservative representative, it was right not to insist too strongly upon differences where such a course could be consistently avoided. I may have been wrong sometimes in not expressing my views, when my views did not agree with those of the hon. gentleman. But I want the hon. gentleman and the House to understand that when I talk in this House or out of it, I speak what I believe. I may be mistaken, and I may not be able to express my views properly, but I would have it understood that there is sincerity behind what I say. But when great questions arise, when not to speak would seem a dereliction of duty, I have spoken my mind with sincerity. As to the discussion that has now arisen, I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman has been well answered from this side of the House, and I am satisfied that his colleagues behind him feel that he has been well answered. Let me read from one of the sincere journals of this Dominion, the editor of which is one of my acquaintances. And I want to say here, as I have said in other places, that I believe that in the sincere and honest expression of its opinion the Montreal "Witness" will be recognized. Some hon. gentlemen about me may feel that I give too high praise to this journal; but, though its editor and I differ in our opinions on many things as widely as men can differ, I believe that he is sincere even when I think him mistaken. I do not wish to discuss this question with regard to the hon. member for North Norfolk, and it is only in the performance of an unpleasant duty that I read from the "Witness" of the 14th of June, 1894, after this whole question had been discussed, its opinion of the hon. gentleman's action. A large part of the article is devoted to this side of the House, by no means in a complimentary strain. Discussing the position of the hon. gentleman, the editor says:—

Mr. Charlton explains that his purpose in suggesting legislation by the United States Congress which would prevent the Dominion Government from imposing export duties upon logs was to