

after Canada had given a preference in her markets to the products of the mother country, he put in her mouth these proud words:

Daughter am I in my mother's house,
But mistress in my own;
The gates are mine to open,
As the gates are mine to close,
And I set my house in order.

Sir, if we adopt to-day this policy, if we have put it in the form in which it is now before the country, it is because we lay it down that Canada is a nation, not a daughter nation of England. Such has been the strong and consistent course of the Liberal party from the time this policy was initiated.

And I may ask now, what has been the policy of the Conservative party? I think I am not offensive or unjust to the Conservative party when I say that upon this question their attitude has been what it is to-day—divided in counsel and divided in action. So far as this House is concerned, our policy more than once has received the assent, at least, the tacit assent, of the members of the Conservative party. It has been more than once reviewed or commented upon, but never challenged or dissented from. Outside of this House it has received the open commendation of the best and most experienced minds in the party. I am bound to say at the same time that it has been censured and criticised—severely censured and severely criticised—by those who within the party boast of their imperialism, who carry abroad upon their foreheads the Imperial phylacteries, who boldly walk into the temple and there loudly thank the Lord that they are not like other British subjects, that they give titles of everything they possess, and that in them alone is to be found the true incense of loyalty. Was it, Sir, because of the proddings of these very zealous and very officious men that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) brought up this question of imperial defence last year? I know not? But on the first day the House met my hon. friend gave notice of a motion designed to bring the matter in concrete form before parliament and the people. I understood the motion of my hon. friend to be an endorsement of the policy which we had always pursued, and in so understanding it I do not think I did him an injustice. I meant to pay him a compliment. At all events, this is the motion he offered:

"That in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibilities and financial burden inci-

dent to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great sea ports."

I repeat that as I construed the language of this motion—unless my hon. friend is a disciple of Tullyrand, who said that language had been given to man to disguise his thoughts—this meant nothing but an endorsement of our policy. It was so interpreted on the other side of the House. If we are to believe the tardy disclosure that we heard the other day from my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who told us that this motion created some stir in the ranks of the party, and that he at once had taken the position that he could not support it. Whether it was for this or some other reason, the fact is that my hon. friend from North Toronto, whilst he had been busy in putting this motion on the notice paper, was very slow to move it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows exactly the reason why. Will he state it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know; perhaps my hon. friend will tell me.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend knows quite well that the motion was postponed from time to time because of conference with my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that my hon. friend—

Mr. FOSTER. Then my right hon. friend had better refresh his memory before he makes the statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pardon me—

I have not finished my sentence. I am not sure that my hon. friend ever spoke to me about it, but if he did, it was simply to suit the convenience of the House, and not because there was on this side any opposition to his motion.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say there was.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Neither did I imply anything derogatory of my hon. friend because he postponed moving it. But the fact is that he postponed it for two months; I do not know what the reason was. My hon. friend suggested to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that if they agreed the matter could be put over.

Mr. MONK. My right hon. friend's memory is evidently deceiving him in saying I opposed the motion. I stated the other day that I thought it was inopportune.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and my hon. friend is still of the same mind. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier thought it inopportune, my hon. friend from North Toronto thought it opportune, many other