

laughter)—without breaking any law, but in accordance with law—with a special law that has been passed, which some think is a freedom, but which I think is a penalty upon churchmen. While poor Mr. Woodward would have to put his pulpit in the fire before he could enter the House, fortunate Mr. Sampson—fortunate by our exertions, fortunate by the exertions of Liberal churchmen all over the country—could stand against me, and undoubtedly he would beat me at the poll. (Laughter.) He could electrify the House of Commons night after night for five days in the week, and he could charm and improve his congregation on the Sunday, just as well as ever. (Much laughter.)

Now, I came here to-night, not only to answer a good many questions, but to ask a few, and I want to know whether what I have said can in any sense be denied. I assert that it is a fact, and that nobody can deny it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am almost ashamed to occupy your time at such length; but I must ask you, for a moment, to consider things, as the French say, *jusqu' au fond*—to look at the foundation of things. Now what are the ultimate foundations of parties? They are very simple. There is prescription and privilege on the one side, producing the Government of the many by the few for the good of the few; and there is, on the other side, the principle of popular self-government, under which the people are governed by the people, and for the good of the people. Now, as long as we adhere to these two principles, I think we are tolerably safe. It was in defence of the principle of civil and religious liberty—and civil liberty involves, of course, free trade and commercial liberty of every kind—that those who preceded me struggled for a lifetime; and I have tried at a great distance, and no doubt with much disadvantage, to follow in their steps. But I am told that I voted against the Liberal party. Now, one of the questions I want to ask—and to which, I think, I should have an answer—is this, What do those gentlemen call the Liberal party? Because my experience of parties is this. There is a great deal that is good under the cowl of each of them, and I very much agree with the late Mr. O'Connell that those names of Whig, and Tory, and Radical, and liquor-seller—and I do not know how many more—are nicknames, and that sensible men are not led away by nicknames and bogies as little boys are frightened in a