

of three, four or five hours is altogether too much of a dose for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Now, Sir, I think that I might well charge the hon. gentleman with having obtained the right to address the House, and with having addressed the House, under false pretenses. I assumed, in my simplicity and innocence, that when the hon. gentleman rose to reply to the clear and lucid statements of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, that we were going to have an exhaustive argument on the Franchise Bill. Instead of that the hon. gentleman has boxed the compass; he has been here, there and everywhere. This tariff, the tariff that worries the life out of the hon. gentleman, that is a nightmare to him, that he dreams of at night and thinks of every hour of the blessed day, appears to worry the hon. gentleman. Don't be worried; it will come down in due time; and perhaps when the hon. gentleman does see it, it will not be exactly as he would like to have it for the purpose of embarrassing the Government.

It was, taking it altogether, an extraordinary speech, closing with an amendment to which I have no objection. I do not want to be offensive, and I never was so in the House; but I do not believe I could describe the hon. gentleman half so well as an hon. gentleman in the Imperial House of Commons described just such a speech as the hon. gentleman has delivered. The words are not mine, Mr. Speaker, I only use the classical language of a distinguished member of the Imperial House of Commons, and say the speech of the hon. gentleman was the veriest tommy-rot as applied to this Bill. The hon. gentleman in the early part of his speech occupied at least half an hour in assigning this reason and that reason for the postponement of this Bill. The House was called too late, he said. That was a tremendous sin on the part of the First Minister. But fortunately or unfortunately it was a sin committed by the Tories for the last thirty years, off and on, and in fact was very frequently committed by them. But whether it was a sin or not, what on earth has it to do with the discussion of the Franchise Bill? The Bill is before the House, the second reading has been moved, the hon. gentleman made a speech in reply, and we are now discussing the Bill. Assuming, for argument sake, that the House was called rather late in the season, surely that is no argument against proceeding with the Bill, discussing its principles and its various clauses? The hon. gentleman has stated that the Bill ought not to have been introduced, that it ought not to be proceeded with, that it ought not to be discussed until this terrible tariff comes down. The tariff is not down yet, but we have a Bill before the House, and surely hon. members are going to occupy the time of the House in discussing some measure that is

not before the House. Then the hon. gentleman was much concerned about the spring ploughing and the farmers. Why, Sir, he has supported a Government ever since he came into Parliament that never thought of the farmers; they paid great attention to the combinesters and the large manufacturers, but they had very little time for the farmers, and we may now well say, as was said by a farmer during my last campaign: The late Government gave eighteen years to the combinesters; we hope the new Government will give a few years to the interests of the poor farmers. Yet the hon. gentleman regrets that Parliament was called so late because it interferes with the spring ploughing. Why, he never had a plough in his hands in his life; I doubt whether he could tell the head from the tail.

Mr. FOSTER. I never saw a plough.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman could not handle one. Again, the hon. gentleman is very much concerned regarding the possible absence of the Premier from the Queen's Jubilee. My own opinion is that the hon. gentleman himself would like to be there. He wishes at all events the leader of the House to attend the Queen's Jubilee, and he asks what is the Liberal party going to do when the great Liberal leader is absent. Why, we are not so badly off as is the party opposite; we can spare the leader of the Liberal party, and if he goes to England we can find ten men to lead the House in his absence, indeed when I look around I see a score of members who are well able to lead the House in the absence of the Prime Minister. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not, however, a man to lead them except the old baronet from Cumberland, and we all know the experience of the party during the few months he was head of the Government. He led them into the ditch, they are there now, and my earnest prayer is that they may remain there a long time. Then the hon. gentleman had a fling at my friend the Postmaster General. My hon. friend introduced a few Bills, probably good in principle and perhaps they might have been better in practice, but because he does not as a Minister of the Crown introduce those Bills now and press them, the hon. gentleman is terribly concerned. Why, it has taken all the Postmaster General's time from daylight to dark and well into the small hours of the morning to unravel post office matters and try and correct the scandals that were perpetrated by the Tories when they were in power, and I believe it will take the Postmaster about the remainder of his natural life to straighten them out. Post offices sold, mail contracts sold in open market—it will take a long time before the Postmaster General will be able to undo what hon. gentlemen on the other side of the