

man knows himself that never did a minister make a more serious blunder than did the Minister of Agriculture. His own colleagues sitting about him know it, feel it in their hearts. The common sense of the country sustains the very 'same position.' And yet the minister comes up and says: Oh, we do not go in for pedantic solidarity, we are not built that way. We have our differences of opinion, and whilst we think alike sometimes, we think differently at other times. But, Sir, why is it that what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander? In making the comparison I do not urge it to its literal fulfilment; but what I say is this: What is sauce for Mr. Tarte as a minister of the cabinet ought to be sauce for Mr. Fisher, ought it not?

Now what was the head and front of the offending of Mr. Tarte? Mr. Tarte essayed to be honest; whether he always succeeded or not I am not bound here to decide. But for that once I will bear testimony that so far I could read his purpose and his action, he essayed to be honest, and to drag his own fellow members out from the miserable web of deception they had woven about themselves into plain, honest Anglo-saxon truth telling. Who does not know, and who did not know that the cabinet whose head the right hon. gentleman is, has, since 1896, administered the trade and tariff matters of this country on the basis of protection as a principle? Who does not know that it would be insulting anybody's intelligence to say the contrary? A number of them thought that they could go on for ever practising protection but professing free trade, even in carrying out an active policy. Mr. Tarte was not built that way. He said: Gentlemen, say what you mean and be truthful; if you won't, I will. And so he argued for protection. In what these gentlemen were carrying out, there were differences of opinion as to degrees, but as to principles there was none, in so far as carrying out their policy was concerned. Now, Sir, because Mr. Tarte stood upon the platform of the country and argued for fuller protection for certain things, Mr. Tarte is told by the Prime Minister that he must get out of the cabinet, and he went out. Mr. Fisher as a farmer is one thing, Mr. Fisher as a Minister of Agriculture is another. In which role he is the most effective, I am not bound just now to say. But, Sir, if ever there was a policy solemnly affirmed, it was the policy that this cabinet, in a place even more sacred and authoritative than in this House of assembly, reiterated, namely, in the interprovincial or colonial conference in London, when all the colonies and the empire were together. They solemnly placed themselves on record as in favour of the preference, of giving it by the colonies, and the asking of it in return by Great Britain. And yet, Sir, after repeated statements of that kind, pledges as clean, and as clear cut, and absolute as could be, one of their number rises and, on a public plat-

form, says that as a farmer and as Minister of Agriculture he is glad that Great Britain has not given a preference. He believes it would work harm if she did, and he enters the fight now actively begun in Great Britain, throwing his weight, not as a farmer—which would not be very strong, not simply as plain Mr. Fisher, which would not be very much stronger, but as a member of a Canadian cabinet speaking to the people of the British isles,—throwing his weight against the policy of a preference. Was there ever a plainer contravention of the solidarity of a cabinet? And the answer of the Prime Minister, with all respect, is a trivial answer, an answer which does not answer, and which was not meant to answer, but it was the best that could be done after the rare blunder made by the Minister of Agriculture.

Well, Sir, other members talked besides the Minister of Agriculture. We have had another minister who has opened his mouth and spoken, none other than the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), the representative of the war forces of this country. At a meeting in the city of Ottawa he delivered himself of a most surprising declaration for a cabinet minister of a colonial government, the government of a colony forming part of the empire to which we belong. What was his statement, Sir? In discussing the question of contributions and help in the protection of Canada and the protection of the empire, after having made several statements with which we will not quarrel with him, he makes this rather astounding statement:

He dissented from the view of the lecturer on the Monroe doctrine, and stated that behind that doctrine were the guns and warships of the United States, and the land power of 80,000,000 souls. Surely if that doctrine meant anything, it meant that Canada was safe from foreign aggression, it meant that neither Germany, or Russia, or any other foreign power would for one moment, whether England were strong or weak, be permitted by the United States to place a hostile foot in this country. That might not be the law of nations, but it was the law of power, and there was no disguising the fact that the United States had told the world that that was their policy.

Now, Sir, boiled down to one single statement, what is it? That we as a country place our dependence for the inviolability of our territory, not upon our own strong right arm and preparedness to resent insult and aggression, not on the might and power of Britain from whom we sprang and to whom we owe allegiance, but upon the grace and favour of a foreign, and may be at any time, a hostile power. The Minister of Militia of Canada has no better word to utter in this budding era of national sentiment and self-dependence which is becoming every day stronger in Canada, he has no better word to give to the people of Canada than this: By the grace and favour of the United States we