

you ever know a more comprehensive meaning than that? Hon. gentlemen can well understand why the distinguished leader of the opposition wished to get a term that could be understood by the beneficiaries of protection, and in choosing 'fitting protection,' he has a phrase which can be made to suit all. It has not become so popular as I might expect, because I have only heard it twice in this House. But you know it takes people time to become acquainted with a new song. The old song was the N. P., and the words 'fitting protection' does not come in as nicely, and the letters F. P. will not, in their affection, take the place of N. P.

So, the first plank in the new policy is, fitting protection. The second plank in their policy is race hatred. I am not going to dwell long upon that, perhaps enough has been said about it. But, I am bound to say that every effort—I am not going to say of the leader of the opposition or of his immediate friends—but, every effort that could be made was put forward to cause the people of Canada outside of Quebec to understand that the people in Quebec were disloyal. I admit that the people of Quebec need no apologist, but I am going to be one. All I will say is that he cannot be as good a citizen as he ought to be who will not rejoice more in the efforts to please any race in Canada than, scavenger like, to try to find out whether there is not something wrong with them. There can be only one reason for it. I speak for myself when I interpret the speech lately made by the distinguished leader of the opposition in Quebec, as necessitated by the work done previously to try to make our French fellow-citizens appear disloyal. I have no doubt he found it necessary, and his friends instructed him that he must go down and do something in the province of Quebec to counteract the bad influences of the position taken and the words spoken. I have no doubt that this is the counter-irritant to make the people of Quebec believe that he was their friend, and that he would preserve them from the millions that were going to be imposed on them through taxation by the Liberals, both in war and in peace, as part of the British Empire. This was said to frighten them in their pockets, and make them believe that they would be better off with the leader of the opposition than with the Liberals. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite sing much more chirpy now than they did about that question. The member for Addington mentioned it to-day, of course he was instructed to do it, but he was wise enough not to follow it. Six or eight weeks ago any man that would mention that in this House would go on for an hour to prove the statement he made was correct. Have they discovered that, after all, there is intelligence in Quebec? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country, whether Protestant or

Catholic, whether English or French, are too intelligent to be misled by anything like that. Our growth has not been any more than good citizens would hope for, but sure am I that the growth of Canada since confederation has been sufficient to make the people understand the relations in which the people stand to each other in any part of this country. I believe there is a feeling in the hearts of the people that it does not make to the betterment of Canada or to the building up of the highest kind of citizenship to attempt in any way to belittle, or to give a false impression of any section of the people of this country.

The third plank in the platform, in this threefold platform, is that we must have our pound of flesh from Great Britain. We cannot give Britain anything unless we get something. We owe her nothing. We will not give them a preference for a single dime in Canada unless they give us a preference in Great Britain. The hon. member who just spoke before me spoke about our being able to supply Great Britain with food. Did he ever apply himself to study the statistics of Great Britain? Does the hon. gentleman know that it requires over 300,000,000 bushels annually to feed the people of Great Britain? Does he know that last year they only raised between 60,000,000 and 70,000,000 bushels, and that 230,000,000 or 240,000,000 bushels must be got from the outside world to support the people of Great Britain for one year? While last year we exported the largest amount of any year in the history of Canada, we sent less than 25,000,000 bushels to Great Britain. Now, the bargain that is to be made with Great Britain in making this preferential tariff is practically this: Although, in the meantime, you pay a duty upon the food you have to get from the outside world, you have a prospect before you that, whereas last year we only sent you 20,000,000 bushels, yet, some day we will send 30,000,000, and some day afterwards 40,000,000, and so on, until some day we will go up to 100,000,000 bushels. But, Great Britain all the time has to increase the price of her food supply to her artisans and workmen in order that Canada may get an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. I would think that the very mention of these statistics ought to make these people think a little about it. In all the years I have been in parliament, Mr. Speaker, I have felt that letters patent had been issued in perpetuity under the great seal to hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about Great Britain. She was under the shadow of their wings, and nobody else had any right to talk about her. They were ready by day to fight, and lie down upon the cold earth by night without food, and rise in the morning and fight again for Great Britain. No sacrifice was too great for them, they were the people. Did it ever occur to these gentlemen what we owe