

accrue to them; and he believed that the people would see with distrust such action allowed. It was well known that the confidence reposed in the Bench was unfortunately, and, perhaps undeservingly, being tremendously shaken in this country. He was sorry to make that statement, and, if it were not against the rules of the House, he would state one of the reasons. It was because Parliament had enacted—and he voted for the measure himself—to bring all election questions before the judicial tribunals. While he had supported and voted for that measure, nevertheless, he now saw with regret that, rightly or wrongly, the people were beginning to distrust our Courts of justice. He would go further and say there was a feeling in the country at the present time—he knew it existed and the opinion had been expressed to him—that it would be for the benefit of the Courts if we reverted to the old system of having elections tried by the High Court of Parliament. He might be wrong, and he had been one of the exponents of the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, in regard to the trial of election petitions by Judges, and he had voted against some of his friends on that question.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was so involuntarily startled by the extraordinary utterance of the hon. member for Terrebonne that he cried, "Shame." He was still more distressed to find that the utterances of the hon. gentleman were echoed loudly by the leading members of the opposite side of the House; and he would say that if there was a country which had a Parliament that would recognize and approve the kind of assault the hon. member had made on the Courts, then the Courts could not have much to do with the corruption of that country because Parliament would be so far gone that very little could be hoped from its representative institutions. What had the hon. gentleman done? He had stated that the system of election trials was calculated to destroy the confidence of the people in the Courts. What had he done more? He had given instances of cases pending, in regard to which he stated—although

he expressed some dissent, yet was he evidently in sympathy with the feeling—that the people were afraid justice would not be done. If the hon. member had found cases of a nature so glaring and abuses so great that it became necessary for him to pursue this extraordinary course of attacking the highest Court, there might have been some justification for him. But the hon. member was attacking a Court still in its infancy—a Court which was amenable to nothing but the suspicions of partizans like the hon. gentleman, and none but partizans would utter such sentiments as had been uttered by the hon. gentleman. If there was not a feeling of patriotism wide enough and broad enough to shield the Judges from the low suspicions which sometimes appertained to those scavengers who carried political feelings to an extreme—if there was not the sentiment which hitherto protected the Courts, that they must not be attacked and degraded—then the liberties of the people were about to be lost, and lost through the attacks of the hon. gentleman and those whom he represented by degrading the Parliament which ought to sustain them. The hon. gentleman had spoken of the confidence in the judiciary being weakened because of partizan decisions. He did not take cases of both political parties, but only that of the hon. Minister of Justice. There had been controverted election cases on both sides of the House, but the hon. member could only find an illustration in one affecting a political trial and an opponent.

MR. MASSON: Then I am right.

MR. HUNTINGTON: If the hon. gentleman is right, he blunders into the right. The hon. member spoke as a partizan, as a man who was willing to sacrifice the independence of the judiciary for a momentary triumph over a political opponent in the pending election, by creating the impression that cases were adjudicated in such a manner as to favour one political party or the other. Instead of being an advantage to him, in having taken that view, it ought to be a disgrace to him. He would have been glad to have understood that an hon. gentleman