

timbers on their shoulders, marching up to a door which was locked, barred and bolted and with these heavy battering rams of old he described them as bursting open the door of the citadel, and camping on top of my hon. friend the leader of the present government. He did not say that blood was shed, but certainly that wounds were made. Now I thank my hon. friend for all the balm he has poured upon my wounds, but won't he give me once in a while the opportunity to tend them for myself, and I assure him that I will tend them all, and come out sound and sane at the end?

My hon. friend's sympathy is of later date than I would have been glad to have it. Perhaps, as we travelled together, and ate together, and were entertained together, although we did not sleep together, during the coronation, he has somewhat revised his views of me, and has come to look upon me as a human being, and seeing me so maltreated in the house of my friends, he offers me his sympathy. Thanks. But there have been disappointments of other kinds. I remember attending a meeting in the course of the campaign in one of the Greys, and at what I thought was quite a successful meeting in that county, I noticed a young chap handing out to all and sundry a large poster. I took one in my pocket and carried it to my room. I took it out and read it, and it made the announcement that three nights from that night I was to be cut into small pieces, metaphorically speaking, by the Hon. Hugh Guthrie, soon to be Minister of Justice in the Laurier cabinet. The title was there, the prospective office was there; and if I were to deal a little in gossip I wonder if I could not draw all your ears towards me as I told you, in racy tones and in flowing language, of the many months passed in a perturbed condition whilst the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was casting the horoscope, and wondering in what length of time he should take the seat vacated by the Hon. Mr. Aylesworth, and become Minister of Justice in the government that has been.

However, this is all persiflage. It tends to pass an hour more or less pleasantly, but it is not statesmanship on the part of men delegated by the people to come here and look after the interests of their country, not of interests that lie back in the past, that can never be recalled and much less amended, but the interests of a great and growing country that will, in the present year and in the future, require their best services as trustees. Let my hon. friend bend his acknowledged talents and his great powers to the future issues of this country, to questions that lie about us to be solved, and in which we are all to co-operate in solving. He may not make it

quite so pleasant for us, but I think he will allow me to say that he will advance the interests of the country in a better way than he has been doing to-night. However, I know that all he has said was uttered in a good spirit, and I take it as such.

Now what is the ground, if there has been any ground in all this talk we have heard to-night from the other side? May I say one thing, that my courage has considerably gone up since my right hon. friend made his speech. I do not know how strong we may be on this side, 47, 49, 50 is a very good majority. We were fairly comfortable under that majority, but to think now that with a majority of 50 behind us, if we ever get into a tight place the gallant leader and the gallant crew behind him will come to our help. The Prime Minister can go on now with the development of his policies, with the assurance that in time of stress the government can appeal to our hon. friends on the opposite side for a small contingent of assistance.

Why should not Armand Lavergne belong to the King's militia in the Dominion of Canada? He denounced Mr. Armand Lavergne because he was not imperial enough to fight for Great Britain, and shortly afterwards he poked fun at him, and criticised him because he ventured to appear amongst the militia under the kindly care of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Sam. Hughes). I should think he might have hailed with delight the appearance, out of that hot bed of degenerate Nationalism which he described to-night of one bright and shining example, who comes up to the support of his country and wears the colours of the King's militia.

But are they all at peace with each other on the other side of the House? I listened to the speech of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—I always do listen to his speeches, mainly because it keeps me going, to find out what there is in them, and so I have to follow them with great care; but if I drew anything at all from the long and able speech of my right hon. friend I drew this from him as leader of the party, that the question of reciprocity with the United States of America was neither dead nor put aside. Why all the speech, why all the deploring of the action of the country on the 21st of September, why all the declaration that it was the result of passion and prejudice? Why the insinuation if not more that in the other sister countries of the empire, and the heart of the empire itself, we could not reap as great benefits in the way of interchange of trade as we could from trade with the United States of America as set out in the reciprocity agreement? Why his sympathy for the Northwest, because of the ill done to them on September 21st, unless beneath it all there