

fit of the whole country, I shall be glad to support a measure of that kind. But it has been stated by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that the reason why it is absolutely necessary that we should have this franchise is because of the plebiscite. I think he was well answered by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who asked why the provincial voters' list could not be used for the plebiscite.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask if hon. gentlemen opposite intend to run the business of the House, or if they will leave it to the Government to do that?

Mr. CRAIG. We are going to help the Government to do it. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) if he is part of the Government? I have just been wondering where the Government is: I do not see any of them in their places. I do not suppose they have resigned, but they must have something very important on hand if they have not time to listen to this discussion. I see in their places the two Controllers, and I am very glad to see them. However, I submit that what I have said is a complete answer to the objection raised by the hon. gentleman for North Wellington.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, no.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman says "no." But I fancy he does not want to be persuaded. It would seem that he is not satisfied with the provincial lists, for the plebiscite, but would be quite satisfied with the provincial lists for elections for the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CRAIG. Certainly.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) is a pronounced temperance man. But, while he is perfectly satisfied with the provincial lists to decide the question of temperance, he is not satisfied with the provincial lists for the elections of members for Parliament.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman says that I am a pronounced temperance man. I do not take that as an insult at all. He says, further, that I am quite satisfied to have the plebiscite held on provincial lists, but I am not satisfied to have members of this House elected on provincial lists. Now that is entirely out of the question, and I will tell you why. I object to going on with this Franchise Bill for the reason I have stated, namely, that I want as perfect a measure as possible when we do frame such a Bill, and I hold that the measure submitted to the House is not much of an improvement on the present Franchise Act. Now, I would only consent to take a plebiscite vote on the provincial lists, because the hon. gentlemen opposite say these pro-

MR. CRAIG.

vincial lists are all right to elect members of the House upon. I take them at their own word, they are satisfied. An hon. gentleman opposite says: I am not satisfied to elect members on it. But I say he is satisfied to elect members on it, and he should not object at all. I am satisfied to take a plebiscite vote on the provincial lists. I do not see what reason he has to object at all, yet he is the very man that says no. So I say to him: You are not satisfied to take a plebiscite on the provincial list, but you are satisfied to elect members of this House on the provincial list. Where is the common-sense argument in that? So, Sir, I will say further that if the tariff was not coming down this session I would be quite willing to go on and discuss this measure, and try to make it a good one. But I hold we will not have time to discuss this Bill; I hold that the tariff is the great question that is coming before the present session of this House. I hold that the country is not crying out at all for a new Franchise Act, but the country is asking the Government to give it a new tariff. I do not say they want a new tariff, but they know they have got to accept a new tariff, and they want to have it settled for good, if they possibly can have it settled. Now, Sir, it has been said by some, and I have seen it stated in some papers, that the Opposition have made up their minds to obstruct business. I deny that altogether. We have no intention of obstructing business. But I hold there is no need of obstructing business in the least. Why, there will be plenty of business to do. I understand an offer has been made that, instead of going on with the second reading of this Bill, the Government should bring down the Estimates and go on with them. That is not obstructing business. We have no desire to obstruct business. We are all anxious to get on with the business; we are all desirous that the House should close in time to allow the First Minister to go to England and represent this country there. The Opposition are just as anxious to assist him in doing that as the members of the Government side of the House are. And we say now to the Government, and we have said to them: If you bring down your Estimates, we are willing to go on with them. But we do think that it is not right to urge us to go on and consider the Franchise Bill, of which there is no need, before the tariff comes down. This is a Bill which there will not be time to consider after the tariff comes down. Then not only the Estimates might be gone on with but there is another Bill which could be taken up, the Superannuation Bill, which we have no objections to go on with. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said about all I want to say. As I said before, I did not rise to discuss this Bill, or the old Franchise Bill; I rose to give my reason for supporting the amendment of the hon. member for York. I think I have given good reasons why this measure should