

this side of the House,—that he is not the whole family and may I suggest to him that he should apply to his own branch of the family the same rule as that which applies to the potatoes—the best part of it is underground.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Does that apply to the one on your side?

Mr. LENNOX. No, the hon. gentleman cannot even now see the point. Probably the hon. gentleman has so habituated himself to thinking that the mantle of that very able man, Dalton McCarthy, descended—not upon his son, for he has a son in Toronto who is a very able lawyer, but upon this nephew of his, that he cannot think of anything else. Is he like the third Napoleon of whom it was said that the only good thing that could be said of him was that he was the nephew of his uncle? It seems to me that this possibly applies to the hon. gentleman. There was a part of his speech which was exceedingly good. It was the part in which he read long extracts from the speeches of his uncle and from the even greater speeches of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The hon. gentleman told us that he changed his speech and that he changed it since yesterday. Does he want us to follow him? He may change again to-morrow and very likely he will, but what struck me at the time was that if he had changed it more than he did it would have been a better speech. I do not exactly know what my hon. friend is aiming at. Surely it could not be that in objecting to the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition he poses as a greater man—that he has found out something that nobody else had found out, that he is going to enlighten the country, that both parties were wrong, the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition, in a sense, between the devil and the deep sea.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Which is the devil and which the deep sea?

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. leader is the deep sea.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I think I must have been deep sea fishing then.

Mr. LENNOX. And so you were. I do not want to elevate my hon. friend into the distinction by talking about him. He may have a chance of fame if I talk about him for too long and I think I will leave him to his own meditation and his own speech. He spoke of shooting from behind hedges. Who has been shooting, on this side of the House from behind hedges? He has been a long time on that side of the House, he sits behind a gentleman who skulks behind the lines of Torres Vedras, he has learned something about shooting from behind hedges and let me tell him that hon. mem-

bers on this side of the House are generally in the habit of speaking their minds distinctly, of speaking what they think, that they have the courage of their convictions, that they are not afraid of speaking out on practical politics, but not upon these imaginary theories, which, as I say, enter nowhere and come out nowhere. What was the policy which my hon. friend throughout this discussion advanced in respect to Protestantism of which he is the champion? To do something to prevent the imposition of separate schools upon the Northwest Territories? I think that anybody who listened to the tirade of abuse from start to finish of my hon. friend's speech in reference to the hon. member for North Toronto, the hon. gentleman who represents the riding in which he lives, would come to the conclusion that from first to last his object was to apply names to the Conservative party and to heap abuse upon my hon. friend from North Toronto. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will suffer much from the statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe. That hon. gentleman had a twinge of conscience when he was talking. What was he afraid of? He threw up his hands and prayed to Heaven that he might not inflame the passions of the people of the country. Is there any danger of his inflaming the passions of the people of the country? Is there any danger of many people reading his speech or taking cognizance of his doings? He varies his speeches. He need not be afraid. He will never inflame the passions of anybody. But, what was the object of it all?—the evident object was to do a party service for the right hon. gentleman whom he has served so faithfully during the whole period of this parliamentary career and a more truckling politician has never occupied a seat in this House than the hon. gentleman during the time he has been here. He reminded me of a gentleman, who, speaking to another, was advancing the theory that men are the opposite of their fathers, that they have the opposite traits, the opposite tendencies, peculiarities, &c., and after having enunciated that principle he said: You never met my father. He was a very clever, a very brilliant and a very fine man. And, the other replied: No. I never met your father, but on the principle of opposites, I can imagine that your father was all you describe. I am quite willing to concede to the late Dalton McCarthy all reasonable credit and I imagine that probably if the principle, of opposites, just referred to holds good, I need say nothing further in favour of the late Dalton McCarthy—hon. gentlemen will be prepared to imagine everything that is good of him, having my hon. friend, his nephew with us.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) began his career in this House by reading