

shame. For over thirty years I have been engaged in newspaper work in this country, and I have the honour of the craft very deeply at heart; and if any vestige of reason has been given to the hon. Minister for the attack he made upon the leader of the Opposition this afternoon it must rest solely with such distorted utterances as have gone forth from a section of the press of this country.

The hon. gentleman also gave expression to the opinion—and I assure him that it is an opinion not very deeply shared in either by hon. members surrounding me here or by the people of the country as a whole—that while the right hon. the leader of the Opposition might rightly be termed a good fighter he was a bad loser. Now, I should like to appeal to the members of the House, more particularly those who are new, whether they found anything in the utterance of the right hon. gentleman the other day to substantiate the assertion that he was a bad loser. Did they notice anything in the nature of a whine that fell from his lips as he detailed—and he had a perfect right to detail—some of the difficulties which met him during his recent campaign? Surely he was justified, and amply justified, in placing before the House and the country, on the first opportunity that arose, some of those difficulties and some of the tortuous paths which the then Opposition on certain occasions pursued in their endeavour to discredit him in the eyes of a certain class of people. In his speech there was nothing in the nature of a whine; it was a manly, straightforward statement of facts, and did not in any sense indicate that he was a bad loser. I will tell the hon. minister one thing that my right hon. friend has not lost, and is not in danger of losing: he has not lost one particle of the respect, and admiration, and enthusiastic devotion, and I think I am right in saying, the affection of the members who stand behind him in this part of the Chamber.

Mr. VIEN: They are only a few at that,—the remnant.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Well, there have been some saving remnants. There has been such a thing as the little leaven that leavened the whole; and in time, I predict,—and in my opinion that time is not very far distant—that remnant will have grown to such proportions that those who are inclined to jeer and taunt us regarding our size at the present time may be very fortu-

nate indeed if they can escape the same fate. The hon. gentleman who leads the House (Mr. Mackenzie King), in his remarks the other night, was good enough to refer to our party. He congratulated us, if I remember rightly, upon the slight change that has been recently effected in our designation. He commented, at any rate, upon the fact that the Opposition in this end of the Chamber was now to be known as the Liberal-Conservative party. He went a little further, if I recall the circumstances correctly, and said that we were, in fact, Tories. Well, I for one did not feel any cold shiver running down my back at being so designated.

I know of course that the name "Tory", if applied in the sense in which it was at one time applied in Great Britain and in this country, is now nothing more than a joke. The crusted old Tory, the upholder, rightly or wrongly, of class privilege, is to-day as extinct as the dodo. But there has been a good deal of loose talking, loose thinking and loose press comment during the last few months since the election regarding that historic name Liberal-Conservative, which I for one shall never, I suppose, be able to express how proud I am to bear. It has been said that the name originated in 1867 when the unification of the various provinces was brought about and a government composed of Liberals and Conservatives, headed by Sir John A. Macdonald, consummated Confederation. That is only true in a measure. Considerably further back than that is to be found the genesis of the name. I think it was in 1854 that in this section of Canada, when the forces of the Liberals and Conservatives, known as the Baldwin-Lafontaine party were united in a government headed by MacNab, the name Liberal-Conservative was first used. Since that day I need not draw the attention of even the newest member of this House to the fact that a great deal of Canadian history has been made by that party.

Now, I said a moment ago that the honoured leader of our party had not lost the affection, esteem and respect of those who follow him here or of those who were ranged under his banner in the country, and the principal reason in my opinion why that devotion to him as a leader still exists is the fact that nobody ever has been in doubt, more particularly during the recent campaign, as to his being entirely worthy to bear the name Liberal-Conservative, for he has upheld through thick and thin in every section of this great