

hon. member (Mr. Foster) who last spoke would have recognized only what is due to the House had he endeavoured to curtail his remarks more than he did. The hon. gentleman spoke five hours and twenty minutes on this subject, thus using up in this one speech almost the whole time of two members for the session. I am not going to deny that it is possible there are gentlemen on the other side who might be willing to give their time, or a portion of their time, to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) considering the position he occupies in this House. That is a courtesy that is often extended by one member to another where there is a limit set to the length of speeches. It is quite possible that some hon. members opposite might be willing to yield a share of their time. But we must remember that it is not only during the last two days of this discussion that the hon. gentleman has been on his feet. I have not gone into it carefully, but I should think that at least the time of six members of the opposition has been occupied by that hon. gentleman. I do not know who the six may be. I trust that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is not one of them. For we on this side think that the leader of the opposition has ideas as good as those of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster); and we think it is a little more pleasant to listen to him than it is to listen to the hon. member for North Toronto. The hon. leader of the opposition has not the inveterate habit of our friend from North Toronto of speaking for the sake of speaking, repeating and repeating, and repeating until the repetition becomes tiresome to members on this side of the House—I think I detected signs of weariness on the countenances of some hon. gentlemen opposite. And I do trust that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) may not have given his time to the hon. member from North Toronto. For it is very evident con-

cerning my hon. friend from East Grey that thoughts within him burn at times and seek expression in words—and he is generally kind in gratifying those thoughts with words for their expression. We do not want the hon. gentleman's time curtailed. And I hope that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has not given up any of his time. We should like that hon. gentleman to throw the limelight on the canvas, and give us a picture of the timber limits of the northwest. And our friends from Prince Edward Island too—I do not know that they have not a perfect right to tunnel in and take a part in debate. What conception, then, has this hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) of his importance and standing in this House when he coolly uses that time, if it is not courteously given him—of course, if the time has been given him, by members on that side, I humbly bow to their will. But if they have given the time, I hope they will not try to recoup themselves by taking from the time of hon. members on this side. I have noticed in the debates in this House, especially when we are in Committee of Supply, that hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to resent it if any member on this side ventured to make a remark or even ask a question. I beg to remind such hon. members—if such there be, and I think there are—that every member on this side has just the same right, the same duty is incumbent upon him, to have a thorough understanding of the estimates and of the votes he is called upon to give as hon. gentleman opposite; and, when he seeks information, he ought to have it. The reason why they do not take up more time in this part of their parliamentary work is because, having asked a question, and received a full answer, they are satisfied, and do not repeat, and repeat, and repeat the same question only to receive the same answer. Now, this question of the occupation of the House, I think, is worthy of consideration.