

Majesty's Opposition to-day with how much greater force would he urge the eloquent words which he used in his plea in 1894 for the condemnation of the then Government. The hon. gentleman in another place proceeded to say :

There is not the prosperity among the farmers one would be led to expect from the increase of their exports. Why? Because the farmers sow, and reap, and sell, but they do not toil for themselves ; they toil for monopolists.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER—

It is the old story—" Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes."

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is open to the interrogatory as to whether the same monopolies which in 1894 were those that gathered the sweetness from the toil of those industrious bees—the said bees being the farmers—and if so, whether my hon. friend is without rebuke and without fault if he has allowed his great power in this Parliament to remain unused for nine or ten months and allowed the monopolies to suck the honeyed sweetness out of these same labouring and industrious bees. But, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) was not content to rest there. He says on this matter of legislating on the fiscal policy :

We must take warning from what has taken place in the United States, and if we wish to avoid the crisis which they are now passing through, our duty is at the very earliest possible moment to reverse our system and go back to a more sane fiscal legislation.

He has had that early moment for nine months ; he has had that insane policy, according to his own view, practised in this country for eighteen years ; he has had an opportunity of going back to a more sane policy ; is my hon. friend without blame and without fault before the country ?

Mr. CHARLTON. What has that to do with the Franchise Act ?

Mr. FOSTER. There is another man who does not know what this has to do with the question. I must ask him to cultivate the Christian virtue of patience. He knows pretty well what that is. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has had a very good and a very salutary exercise of his moral qualities on that, in a certain bill which he has been introducing into this House for the last eight or nine years, and which I think he devoutly hopes he will have to introduce for eight or nine years more, for I verily believe, that if the hon. gentleman had the good fortune to get his Bill passed he would feel himself bereft of the only child he has.

Well, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) went on in the same fashion. I will not quote any more, but the point of my quotation and argument—this for the benefit of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)

Mr. FOSTER.

—is this : That if, under the circumstances of 1894, when we had stated the principle upon which we would revise the tariff, and when every business man and business interest in the country knew the principle upon which we would revise it, he brought us to task for being late in meeting Parliament and bringing down the tariff ; what is the blame that attaches to him, when he and his party for eighteen years have declared that they intended to completely revolutionize the present fiscal system, and when he and his party have not had the courage, if they have changed their minds, to give the change to the public, and to state at least before this House—they have been in for two sessions now—the principle upon which they would proceed in the revision of their tariff, and, in the absence of which statement, the threats of eighteen years are held out against every business interest in this country to-day. What blame must attach to the Prime Minister, if, for nine months, he has kept this country waiting, and this Parliament waiting, for the mere enunciation of his view and that of his Government with reference to the tariff system.

But, Sir, there is another reason why we should have been called together earlier, and there is another reason why we should pass through the necessary business of this House with all that haste which is compatible with reasonable and careful work. And what is that ? Not having been called together until the 25th of March, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) knew that there were urgent reasons why we should be out of this early. The reasons that usually exist ; reasons of business, which my hon. friend eloquently portrayed in 1894 ; the reasons of the business men in this House who have large interests, and whose interests demand their attention early in the summer or late in the spring ; and that, therefore, the business of this Parliament ought to begin early and finish early, so that these men could go back to their business with the least sacrifice possible to them for their doing the public work. These reasons are as strong to-day as they were then. But, there are other reasons this session. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) knew that this was the Jubilee year. He knew that the Canadian colony, in conjunction with the other colonies of Great Britain, would wish to be represented by its official head at the Queen's Diamond Jubilee celebration, and he knew that he himself as Premier ought to be in his place there as the head of this colony, along with the heads of the other colonial possessions of Her Majesty. He knew, that that would necessitate an early departure for England. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), even though he had the utmost confidence in his colleagues, that they would be able to manage the ship of state, if he were to take his hand, for a little while, from off the helm—I am almost doubtful if he has that implicit