

the men in this House or of a party in this country; or does he wish the people to believe that he was insincere and that he was looking into a mirror when he described the pot-house politician? I would be unwilling to say a disrespectful word of the hon. gentleman—to say a single word which could at all deteriorate from that courtesy which I know the hon. gentleman is capable of displaying; but what would the country think if we sat by and allowed a gentleman of his eminence and learning and culture to hurl at us such epithets as he has hurled across the floor to-day, without holding up the mirror to him? What a blessed and a pleasant thing it would be if we could “see ourselves as others see us.” Let the hon. gentleman look at his distinguished colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the hon. gentleman who does not like to have people allowed to carry prayer-books around with them. I do not speak of the general ability which that hon. gentleman displays in the discharge of his duties; I do not speak of him as a foul renegade, as being no gentleman, as being a pot-house politician, as he has chosen to speak of those who are at least his equals. I shall speak of the hon. gentleman only as he has displayed himself, and if I am compelled to do this not only in the vindication of the rights of this House, but in the fulfilment of my duty, it is because the hon. gentleman has obtruded an ugly presence in this debate which should call for the censure not only of the members on this side of the House, but of those who sit around him, and who I doubt not regretted the tone he assumed. I want to tell the hon. gentlemen of the other “P,” the distinguished member who comes from down by the sea, and who I hope will be recognized by the culture, the education, the refinement and the geniality which distinguish him—I wish to tell him who talks so glibly about his betters—and as the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) said, I have no doubt that he is kind-hearted when he is not mad with the spirit of partizanship—that perhaps he has not been long enough in this Confederation to understand the question he talked about. He talked of us as if we belonged to the party which had made itself disreputable in public life. We could forgive the hon. member for Niagara for saying—as I understood him to say—that the leadership of this party had always been a disgrace, that we had always upset ourselves by the want of ability in our leaders—I say, we could forgive the hon. member for Niagara for saying this of a party which from the days of Robert Baldwin has been nobly led. The hon. gentleman could be forgiven on the ground that he sacrificed his manners to his partizanship in making a declaration which he must have known he was not justified in making, and which he must have known placed himself in an undesirable position before the country. But, Sir, we cannot forgive the hon. Minister of Marine, although I believe that hon. gentleman disturbed his colleagues more than he disturbed us. It was amusing to see them wince as the hon. gentleman did that which seemed so like nothing else as the act of hurling a fish from one counter to the other. We could forgive that hon. gentleman a great deal, but we should not be forgiven ourselves if we did not take this opportunity of correcting his ignorance. When he speaks with contempt of the Reform party and its leaders let him understand that to that party is due, every amelioration of the condition of the people, in the sense of extending their rights and privileges, which has ever been granted in this country. From the time when the Reformers of this country, fifty years ago, were denounced by the Tories of that day as the Reformers of this day have been denounced here to-night, down to the present; every attempt which has been made to secure privileges to the people, every attempt which has been made to put less burdens and more responsibilities upon their shoulders, has been steadily advocated by this side of the House and as steadily resisted by that. If the hon. gentleman can mention me an instance

Mr. HUNTINGTON.

in exception I will be glad to have him do it now. I would be pleased to sit down and let him have the opportunity. The members on this side of the House have never put forward offensively their claim to be considered a “party of gentlemen,” but they have always been the advocates of the rights of the people. They have always, at least, enjoyed the confidence in the main of those who read and think, of those who act upon their convictions. But this, Sir, is no new thing. It does not apply alone to Canada. It is an element in the very principle of Liberalism the world over. You Conservatives, as you now call yourselves, do not like the word Tory. Our celebrated *litterateur*, Goldwin Smith, has said you do not like that word; it is too old-fashioned. For myself, I think it was a respectable name, and I think when you shook off that name you did not shake off the shackles of Toryism. But, as Mr. Goldwin Smith said, you had to have a deodorizer, and so you called yourselves Conservative-Liberals, or rather Liberal-Conservatives, for I believe that is the name you have adopted; but if you look at the history of the efforts which have been made by slow degrees to win the rights of the people of this country from the early days you will find that although the Tory party sometimes yielded, under fear of loss of power, though sometimes when the majority was against them, they accepted position and salary and carried out the behests of the men they denounced, and thus became the dominant party, yet to the advocacy and the efforts of the Reform party has been due every great measure tending to the amelioration of the condition of the people. From the days when constitutional government was one for Upper and Lower Canada, from the days when municipal institutions were fought for in Upper Canada and seigniorial tenure was the question upon which parties divided in Lower Canada, every great measure tending in the direction of popular rights was initiated by the men whom you denounce to-day, the men who sat on this side of the House the men whom you denounced then as you do now. At your head in the days when municipal government was first talked of in Upper Canada, even a Tory Governor went so far as to declare that municipal reform meant annexation to the United States. They have constantly declared from that day to this that annexation to the United States would be the terrible consequence of every reform we have tried to carry out, and which they have resisted. One day it was municipal institutions, the next day it was constitutional government. All the way down that has been the attitude which the Conservative party, or the Tory party, as you may please to call it, has held towards the Reformers in this country ever since we had anything to reform. Whether we have been in a minority or a majority there was always the same wave of misrepresentation, the same wave of abuse as that with which the hon. gentleman who last spoke has seen fit to close the debate. We have heard a good deal during the progress of this discussion, and particularly from the last speaker, about partizanship. The partizanship of the Opposition is something which seems to be rank in the nostrils of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us see exactly what is the partizanship of this question. I will not go back far. But who are the partizans in this House *à propos* of the Syndicate question? What did the Government do after they made the contract? They called Parliament together. What did they call Parliament together for? Was it merely to register their decrees, or was it for the purpose of getting the opinion of Parliament? Why, they might as well have said to the members of Parliament: “You need not have come here, because we have already settled the thing. If you want to come and vote us down, come on; but if you intend to stick by us, stay at home.” When we arrived here the Government presented the House certain documents for its consideration. Certainly one would have thought from the first start that there was an intention of consulting the House. I have seen a patriotic course of