

may be kept from being swallowed up by the European powers. But did the Minister think one single inch further and ask himself what power would shield us from the aggressiveness of that other foreign power, not in Europe or Asia or Africa but upon this continent and close beside us? It might not be the law of nations he says, but it is the law of power, therein is its terrible menace. The law of power and to be executed to ward off any foreign power from Europe and prevent it getting a foothold on this Canadian soil, but what is to ward off the foreign power on this continent, if the law of power only is involved, from taking the law of power into its own hands and crushing us. What sentiment could be less manly, what sentiment could be less national, what sentiment could be less self-respecting than a sentiment that we must owe to powerful neighbours our immunity from harm and foreign aggression from all others but have no defence and no security against those neighbours themselves if at any time they wished to become the aggressors. I think you may search the annals of countries through and through—the premier is fond of saying that Canada is a nation—you may search the annals of nations through and through and I doubt if you can find an expression made by a dominant member of the government or cabinet of any nation which equals for craven heartedness the expression used by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. If the United States with its guns and warships is to be our security why not go the whole hog, why not get rid of our fortifications and defences, why not get rid of our military schools, and our little standing army and our bands of teachers and trainers and our militia itself and even the minister himself? And why, if the all-sufficient guarantee is the guns and the warships and the navy of the 80,000,000 of people who are close beside us here should we not pay protection to the United States?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to pursue this any further. I wish merely to say in conclusion, in answer to the taunt that harmony is a property or quality unknown on this side of the House but that it is regnant and exuberant on that side of the House, that there is another side light which shows a little different estimate from what the Prime Minister gave today. It is quite true that in choosing his Postmaster General it was a matter of internal economy amongst the party and the rulers of the party. They arranged that as suited them best. Harmony he said, prevails. One other solution of that might be that the only way to secure harmony amongst the members of the family already in was to take one already out and bring him in over the heads of all. I make a present of that as a possible solution of the course which was followed. But is it all harmony within? Another man has talk-

Mr. FOSTER.

ed, no less a man than the Liberal whip, the member for North Ontario, who unburdened himself at a certain time with astonishing frankness and what does the Liberal whip say? Now I suppose that next to the Prime Minister himself the whip is the important man. The internal economy of the party is all at his disposal, he is close to its heart, he listens to its conscience, he lies down with it in slumber, and rises with it when it wakes, and there is no moment of its dreams or of its waking activities that he is not present as tutor and nurse and confidant and director and so when the whip speaks let us all listen. Harmony exuberant, overflowing, like the mellifluous atmosphere of some southern region, laden with fragrance and instinct with beauty. Yes, but Mr. Grant says:

We feel great regret on account of Sir William Mulock's retirement. Sir William has held the confidence of the Liberals of the old school.

So there are two kinds of Liberals and that conduces to harmony, to have two bands in one party, especially to have a school of old Liberals and a school of youngsters, it being supposed that old Liberals have some principles and some regard for decency whilst the young ones are more iconoclastic, or socialistic or something of that kind. There is one important point, there are two schools in the party and there is consequently great inducement to harmony. I deplore the passing of Sir William Mulock, as well as Mr. Grant, but I am more sorry for one thing than any other, I am sorry that when Sir William Mulock's sun hoisted itself out of this political atmosphere and took its westering course towards its final setting that it had not done so in the full glory of its pristine principles. I am sorry that it allowed itself to be submerged into a bank of dull nasty mist and cloud of patronage and that a \$10,000 office seduced him from his allegiance to the principles which he held so doughtily and so strongly. But his health was bad and of course although it was hard work to conduct the post office here, and to fight the new school of Liberals in the party it was easy work to take up a law practice, thrown aside for 22 years and study up all the cases and the procedure that had taken place in that interim and become a working judge on a hard-worked bench. That was child's play, a sort of sanitarium moral and physical, in which Sir William Mulock was to recruit shattered forces and recover his wonted health.

Mr. Grant goes on:

We, the Ontario Liberal members, are very much dissatisfied, although we have confidence in Hyman and Aylesworth. But Mulock cannot be replaced.

There is still no mention of Paterson.