

ponent, before an eager and excited meeting, the vehemence, confidence, daring and energy of Dr. Tupper were bound to prevail. Moreover, Conservatives never forgot that Mr. Huntington had secured the private letters which produced the "Pacific scandal", and they pursued the man with savage joy and merciless ferocity. How often in politics the author of an "exposure" dies, while the victim survives.

Many of those who saw Mr. Huntington overcome at Oshawa attended the meeting at Whitby. The Conservatives were happy and exultant, the Liberals depressed and anxious. But Mr. Mackenzie had resource in debate such as few men of his time possessed. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has said that when he was "on his legs" he had no peer in the House of Commons. There was little or nothing of the finish of oratory in his speeches. There were few ornate or elegant sentences. There was no elaborate preparation or dependence upon memory for felicitous phrases or orderly sentences. His strength was in facts, simplicity of statement, and complete knowledge of the subject. Of stern aspect and without natural gaiety of spirit, he yet had a penetrating humour and was fertile in illustration and anecdote. If he was austere he was just, and seldom sour or intemperate. Mr. Mackenzie's first speech was a quiet, orderly, logical defence of the acts and policies of his Administration. There was frequent cheering, but the Prime Minister's statement did not lessen the desire to hear Dr. Tupper. Nor did Dr. Tupper face an audience in which there was a predominant feeling of personal or political hostility. He was well received and quickly won the favour of the meeting. In those days Dr. Tupper was in full physical vigour. He spoke with tremendous energy. His vocabulary of denunciation was equal even to his own conception of the ineptitude and depravity of his opponents. On this occasion he was—him-

self. He held the Government responsible for drought and blight, for excessive heat and extreme cold, for the blasted corn and the barren fig-tree. The Conservatives warmed by degrees into sympathy, jubilation and confidence. Long before he had finished the meeting seemed to have gone hopelessly against Mr. Mackenzie. But the Prime Minister had fifteen minutes for reply. As the last word fell from Dr. Tupper's lips he sprang to the front of the platform. He stood, stern and unsmiling, while the long cheering for the Conservative spokesman died away. Then with swift, impetuous sentences he fell upon Dr. Tupper. He wasted not a word or a moment. He struck blow after blow with such direct force that the whole structure which Dr. Tupper had reared with such superb assurance and confidence seemed to fall column by column into ruin. I have heard many speeches since that day, but nothing so trenchant and destructive. Of what was said by either speaker I have little recollection. I know that Dr. Tupper was merry over the inconsistencies and "broken pledges" of the Government, and that Mr. Mackenzie met the accusations with the history of a measure that Dr. Tupper had fathered and abandoned. He was guilty, Mr. Mackenzie said, of "the horrible crime of infanticide". He had "not only slaughtered his own child, but trampled on the remains". I was young when Mr. Mackenzie and Dr. Tupper met at Whitby so long ago. To youth wonder and enthusiasm come easily. But, I repeat, that I have heard nothing since from any platform as powerful, destructive and overwhelming as Mr. Mackenzie's reply. Conservatives around me who never had and never would cast a vote for a Liberal candidate rose to their feet and cheered with delight over the performance. That I have seen once only. Recalling such a glorious encounter one regrets that joint political meetings have been abandoned.