

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what it is.

Mr. PLUMB. It does appear there is bad grammar on the other side sometimes.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think there was an error in my grammar, but I think I transposed some syllables. But I thank the hon. gentleman for correcting me. Hon. gentlemen quote so largely from my speeches—extracting their elegant portions—that they may be anxious to quote from this one too. It should be free from all errors. I hope they will quote from it its very proper language. I may say, however, that I am not, generally, in the habit of complaining of interruptions; but the hon. member for Niagara, when speaking the other day, was asked a question by an hon. gentleman on my side, when he resented it, saying he did not want to be interrupted.

Mr. PLUMB. I did not say so.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg your pardon—you did say so.

Mr. PLUMB. I beg your pardon—I said the hon. gentleman who interrupted me will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. ROSS. No; you said more than you are charged with.

Mr. PATERSON. At any rate, the hon. gentleman manifested an indisposition to be interrupted, and there is no hon. gentleman who interrupts members on this side more. I care not if a gentleman asks me a question properly; but when a member professing to be a gentleman, thinks an opponent is making a point—when he feels the iron is entering—and embarks upon a deliberate system of interruption, he places himself beyond the pale of politeness and has no right to be treated in the way he wants. Let me tell the hon. gentleman if he would prate less about British loyalty and study more British courtesy and politeness, he would stand a little higher in the estimation of every true lover of British institutions in this House. Let him speak if he has anything to say; but I do not like the continual chatter and gabble. I would bear with it on account of his years; but he has placed himself beyond the pale of forbearance. He systematically interrupts without sense or reason. He should be prepared to defend his course and give reasons for it.

Mr. PLUMB. Will the hon. gentleman, with his usual courtesy, allow me to call attention to the fact that, for three years, in this House, when he was one of the tyrannical majority, I never rose but I was hounded down by himself and his supporters. I never was able to make my voice heard, for the howls on the other side. I do not claim anything exceptional. I rise like any other man who has a right to speak here, and the hon. gentleman knows how systematic were the attempts to hound me down. There has been no disposition on this side ever to trifle with hon. gentlemen on the other side. They may cry "Order," as they like. But we, as a minority on the Opposition side, were never treated with the forbearance and courtesy with which we have treated our opponents, to whom we always listen. We have never formed a *claque* to prevent them from speaking. We have listened to them and their tirades, hour after hour, with a forbearance which I say now has almost ceased to be a virtue.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman's defence is not a denial of my statement. He could not deny it. A man with less vanity than the hon. gentleman, or less anxious to have *Hansard* record his wise sayings, would have been appalled by the noise often made whilst he spoke, but it was not I who made it.

Mr. PLUMB. Very likely not.

Mr. PATERSON. No; it was his own political friends who hounded him down by their noise.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman knows better.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. PATERSON. No, not only in this House, but in the country, if report speaks true; particularly at North Ontario, the cry was: "take this man out of the constituency; he is doing more harm than good." You must not try to fasten upon the Opposition the blame of the interruptions here received.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is openly stated and reiterated frequently that at North Ontario the hon. member for Niagara was treated discourteously, that his speech was not acceptable to the people he addressed. I was present, and there is no foundation for that statement whatever.

Mr. PATERSON. The statement has been reported in the press; the hon. Minister knows that.

Mr. PLUMB. Who reported it?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I admit the report has been published.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. member for North Ontario.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. the Finance Minister has not attempted to deny that it was his own political friends in the House, on more than one occasion, who interrupted him with their noise.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I was not here at the time.

Mr. PATERSON. On reflection, I admit you were not here, but the hon. member for Niagara knows it himself. I do not wish to be discourteous, however, nor to say a word offensive to any member. I never use personalities, but in discussing public questions I have a right to be listened to without continual interruptions, made for the purpose of making me lose the thread of my argument. I do not know that I need continue speaking longer, as other hon. gentlemen wish to address the House. I have only a few words to say in conclusion on one other matter, and that is, that the party to which I belong have been not only misrepresented on this trade question and many other subjects, but the hon. gentlemen have made a practice, not only in the House, but through the country, of pointing to us as a party not thoroughly loyal to the British Crown. They charge us with annexation proclivities, with a leaning towards the United States, and scheming for political annexation. I remember the leader of the Government, in a talk on one occasion, at a Canadian gathering, described the Grits as hybrids, and said that they were a cross between a Democrat and an Annexationist.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. members opposite say, hear, hear, as if they endorsed the sentiment. I think, Sir, those gentlemen will have to look in vain through the history of that political party to find evidence of disloyalty. They are a party, it is true, that do not prate about their loyalty upon all occasions. They take it for granted that being loyal men every one will know that they are loyal, and that it is not necessary to proclaim it on the house-tops. With reference to annexation sentiments being held by them, I deny it. I have to rejoice that I do not belong to a party, the leader of which expressed in plain terms that his choice as between independence and annexation would be annexation to the United States. I am happy to say that utterance coming from the leader of one of the great political parties, came not from the leader of the political party with which I am associated. I have to rejoice that it was not the leader of the Reform party that pointed the young men of Canada to look to Holland and to Belgium to see the position their country occupied with reference to the United States. I am happy to say that it was not the leader of the Reform party that belittled his country by pointing the people of Canada to those countries in Europe surrounded by powerful nations without the power of extending and developing themselves, to show that we