

principles of the Conservative party in the following language:—

TORY PRINCIPLES.

“Your average Tory is never content in school section, in township, in county or in city, in Provincial Parliament or in Dominion Parliament, unless he is fattening on the sweets of office. I know what that party can endure, what sacrifices they can make for the sake of showing what they call their true patriotism. They are willing to sink any principle no matter how precious it may be to them—and we all know how precious principles are to Conservatives. There is nothing in their professions or in the doctrines they hold that they are not willing to sink in order that the country may have the inestimable benefit of their services as a Government. It surely ought to make every Canadian proud to feel that there is a political party who are actuated by motives so pure and patriotic as to be willing for the country's sake to forget anything and everything they have ever done in order to be in a position to serve the people. I scarcely think it would be fair in us to take advantage of patriotism so pure as that; it would be too hard to ask them to make such a wonderful sacrifice on the altar of their country as a whole stock-in-trade of Tory principles and professions.”

LIBERAL PRINCIPLES.

Speaking at Colborne on July 9, he referred thus to the principles of his own party:—

“We are no Liberal party if we say that we have done all that can be done, for reform will never cease so long as this world is peopled by sinners and controlled as it sometimes is by sordid motives. It rests with the Liberal party not merely to initiate such legislation as the party as a whole demands, but it rests with individual members of that party to give their special consideration to such particular views as they may hold; and our real danger is not in advocating as individuals measures which the party as a whole has not yet learned to value and respect, but in pursuing our hobbies so far that we detach ourselves from the main body on the march and so expose our flank to the enemy's fire. Let us as Liberals combine together; let us at such meetings as this discuss the public measures that may be or should be introduced and the policy that ought to be followed. If we cannot carry all the particular measures we want, let us carry such as we can carry, going on step by step and keeping together.”

SIR HUGH ALLAN'S SUBSCRIPTION.

Mr. Mackenzie had the happy faculty of introducing easily and naturally a story to illustrate his point. Speaking at Kingston on June 27, he said:—

“It seems it was all a mistake to suppose that Sir Hugh Allan contributed money for the purpose of corrupting the electors. True, Dr. Tupper says in one speech that Sir Hugh Allan gave a handsome subscription to the election fund and Sir John received it in the same spirit. That is the way in which the affair was spoken of. I do not wish to say a single word disrespectful to Sir Hugh Allan, but I believe that if there is a business man in Canada who more than any other understands his own business that man is Sir Hugh Allan. But I sincerely venture to hope that he will not mingle in politics—at least I hope that he and Sir John will not mingle in politics together. He is a Scotchman, a shrewd business man, possessing many of the characteristics attributed to his fellow-countrymen. You have all heard that old slander which Dr. Johnson first uttered against Scotchmen—that farthings were coined for the purpose of enabling them to contribute to charitable objects. I don't believe that myself, but I do believe that if there is a Scotchman in Canada who knows the value of the farthing better than another, it is Sir Hugh Allan; and I don't think he was likely, under the circumstances, to give to Sir John and his colleagues a sum nearing \$200,000, and to expend on his own hook—to use a somewhat vulgar phrase—\$160,000 more merely to secure the success of the Conservative party as Dr. Tupper says.”

MR. HUNTINGTON'S ENEMIES.

Hon. L. S. Huntington was never forgiven by the Tories for the part he took in laying bare the Pacific scandal of '73. Mr. Mackenzie told the following good story at

Forest on June 29 with reference to the attacks upon his colleague:—

“As for Mr. Huntington, he has been pursued with a venom that would be perfectly unaccountable but for the fact that he was the man who first put a finger upon their sore spot in 1872-73. They entertain much the same kind of feeling towards him that is said to have been entertained by a countryman of my own on a certain occasion. Donald was on his death-bed, and when the minister called to administer ghostly consolation he told Donald very earnestly that before he passed away he must forgive all his enemies. Donald was rather loth to admit this article into his creed even at that trying moment, but he tried to compromise the matter by agreeing to forgive all his enemies but two. He was told this would not do; it was a true spirit of forgiveness that was required which would embrace all mankind. “Weel,” he says, “if there's nae help fo it, I maun e'en dae it, but”—turning to his son—“de'il tak ye, Donald, if ye forgie tem.”

A TORY LADY'S VIEW.

Speaking at Unionville on July 3 he told the following story on the difference with which Sir John Macdonald and himself were regarded by some:—

“I was amused at hearing what a very respectable old Conservative lady in Hamilton said to a friend of mine the other day. She belongs to an old Conservative family, reads all the Tory newspapers, and is a very strong Conservative herself—for of course we cannot get all the good people to come to us in a day. She expressed to my friend her very great sorrow that Mr. Mackenzie should be guilty of doing such things as these. ‘But,’ said my friend, ‘Mackenzie didn't do it.’ ‘Well, now,’ said the lady, ‘do you think they would put such things in print if there was not some foundation for them.’ ‘Yes,’ said my friend, ‘I am quite sure they do; and what would you think of the Conservative leaders if they did so and so?’ ‘Ah,’ she, replied ‘there is a great difference, for you know Sir John does not pretend to be a Christian and Mackenzie does.’”

TA F'HAIRSON.

Speaking at Fergus, on July 7th, he referred thus to Senator, now Sir David, Macpherson:—

Senator Macpherson's appearance in the public arena as an essayist and debater with two others, in the persons of the late Premier and Dr. Tupper, reminds one of a passage in Aytoun's poems, half English and half Gaelic, which describes the feud between the Clans Macpherson and MacTavish:—

F'hairson swore a fued
Against the Clan MacTavish;
Marched into their land
To murder and to ravish:

For he did resolve
To extirpate the vipers
With four and twenty men
And five and thirty pipers.

But when he had gone
Half way down Strath Canaan,
Of his fightin' tail
But three were remainin'.

They were all he had
To back him in ta battle.
All the rest had gone
To drive off ta cattle.

In the present case Senator Macpherson becomes an essayist and Sir John Macdonald and Dr. Tupper are

The only twa that's left
To back them in ta battle.

And before this redoubtable triumvirate we are expected to vanish as an Administration into thin air.”

A COLLEAGUE'S TRIBUTE.

A WARM TRIBUTE PAID THE EX-PREMIER BY THE HON. EDWARD BLAKE TWENTY YEARS AGO.

In a speech at Kincardine on July 2, 1872, Hon. Edward Blake paid the following tribute to Mr. Mackenzie:—