

But let me go on now to glance at some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). He led off by saying that he would take as his text a quotation from a speech made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) which he read. It seemed to me a text that took him an awfully long time to explain, for he was working at it for over an hour, and, when he got through, the text stood in all its strength just the same as before. The Minister of Agriculture gave that hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) several nuts to crack, and the hon. gentleman does not seem to have made much of a success of the cracking. I suppose he has been pondering over that speech ever since he was down at Stanstead. No doubt he wrestled with it there and he wrestled with it here for an hour or more, and with what result?

Why, simply that when this government came into power it applied business methods to the administration of its affairs, and times mended and have gone on mending ever since. That is a patent truth to every man, and to explain that away cannot be done in an hour, if there is any excuse for the five hours' speech of the hon. gentleman trying to do the impossible task that he set himself to do. Now, I do not often read extracts or make campaign speeches in the House, but I will give you one gem of the hon. member for North Toronto—who, by the by, would, I think, have been as courteous to me as I was to him, if he had not wearied himself quite as much, and would have been present to hear me after addressing so many of his remarks to myself. But when I am quoting what he has said at a meeting, I would rather he were here so that if there is any mistake about it he could put me right. This was at a meeting at Mimico. I was not at the meeting, but I arrived there within a night or two, and I took up the 'Mail and Empire,' which, of

course, might not be an authority on all matters, but would be accepted as an authority by the gentleman who spoke in the Conservative interest on that occasion. Here was the gem of the speech that struck me:

"The people of the country had seen the exposures made against the Laurier government, the reckless and extravagant expenditure with which they had afflicted the country, and as was shown by the recent by-elections, the people were tired of such administration, and were everywhere sending Conservatives to parliament to support Mr. Borden and his friends and to eradicate the evils that had been brought on by the Laurier administration."

Well, there have been thirty-nine of those by-elections, and thirty Liberals were returned and nine Conservatives. Now, here is the dilemma we are in. If the hon. member for North Toronto spoke the truth—and we are not at liberty to impugn his statement—we have this other difficulty staring us in the face, that in this House are thirty Liberal members that were sent here as Conservatives to turn out Laurier and put in Borden, and they don't seem to know it. Now, which horn of the dilemma shall we take? Are those men in a right position now in supporting the government? If they are, how will they characterize the statement of the hon. member for North Toronto? Of course, I am not at liberty to doubt him, because if he said it was so, Mr. Speaker, we have to accept his word.

Now, coming down to the argument he made, attempting to explain away that patent truth that he read as his text from the speech of the Minister of Agriculture. He said that we kept in the background the fact that we came in when times were good, and that there had been some years of depression before they went out. Well, if that be