

this government calls a preference. The hon. gentleman says the voice of Great Britain has decided with no uncertain sound that they want none of it. Not so sure, Mr. Speaker, about that. Forty-four per cent, we are told, of the electors of Great Britain voted in favour of the Chamberlain policy pure and simple. That is not so bad when we consider that in the last British house there was not a man elected on that platform. Even Mr. Chamberlain himself during the previous election was opposed to it, and now he sits in the House heading a solid phalanx of about 150 members elected for that very purpose, putting through what the Minister of Agriculture says Canada does not want. If he thinks that question is dead, I do not agree with him. I think the fight is but beginning, and I think he will find that it is going to be a very live question in the British empire for the next few years. While he may rejoice that Great Britain turned down that project apparently, in the meantime we who advocate the policy are by no means discouraged. We know that a solid phalanx of 150 men have been elected there to support the policy, and it is well enunciated as a policy of the unity of the empire based upon commercial bonds.

Though the Minister of Agriculture says that he wants none of it, I think he does not speak for the whole of Canada, not even for those whom he professes to speak for, the farmers. I believe that if there is one class in this country more than another who would rejoice at a mutual preference it is the farmers. They have more to gain than any others. The hon. gentleman tells us we have a preference already. Not a bit of it. We have no preference at all in the British market other than what quantity and quality give us, and that is good in any market. Britain does not buy our cheese because it is made in Canada, but because it is of the right quality. She does not buy our bacon because it is made in Canada, but because it is of the right quality. But where is our preference in the British market? They have bought their butter from Denmark for years, and if we could deflect a part of that trade in our direction would that not be an advantage to our farmers? If we could succeed in getting our cattle into Great Britain alive, as they used to enter, would not that be an advantage to Canada? Still the hon. gentleman says that we want none of this mutual preference. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that if there is one policy that this country does want it is a mutual preference in Great Britain. Therefore I sincerely regret that the hon. gentleman has gone back upon what his cabinet had said they wished for when they visited England. They put themselves on record there as being in favour of a preferential tariff between Canada and Great Britain. I believe at that time they were sincere, if

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

they were not sincere, it is much to be regretted that they misled the public men and the people of Great Britain. The speech of the Minister of Agriculture has been quoted from end to end of Great Britain. He tells us it attracted more attention than he expected. It is true it attracted more attention than any speech the hon. gentleman has ever made. But it was not on account of its wisdom, not on account of its eloquence, nor of its policy, but it was because it caused a tremor throughout the British empire, it caused an unrest, and men looked into each others' faces and said, what does that government of Canada really mean? We would like to know what this government really means. Here is a minister of the Crown who tells us to-day that he was speaking simply as a farmer. I do not know whether his voice as a farmer is any less mighty than it is as Minister of Agriculture. I think I would as soon accept his word as a farmer as I would accept it as Minister of Agriculture, I think it is quite as valuable. But no doubt he was speaking what he felt in his own mind at the time, and that he did rejoice that in the meantime the Chamberlain policy had been knocked out, as he expressed it. But it is not dead. It is true that for a time it will not become the law of Great Britain nor of the empire; but I am still one of those who are enthusiastic enough to believe that Great Britain will yet see that it is in her interest and in the interest of the whole empire. I believe she will yet establish a mutual bond of trade between herself and all her colonies, and thus preserve for all time the British empire. The hon. gentleman tells us that we can be loyal without any trade sentiment. That is quite true, Mr. Speaker. We have been giving our lip loyalty to Great Britain for many years past and our trade to the United States. We desire that more of our trade should be given to Great Britain and less to the United States, and the way to bring that about is by a mutual preferential tariff.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard something about solidarity in the cabinet. We have been told that it exists in the Liberal party. I do not think myself that it is very creditable to hon. gentlemen to rejoice over those Northwest elections. They may feel a certain pride in those elections that is not shared by all their friends, and it is not shared by any on this side of the House. If there is anything about which we should be ashamed, Mr. Speaker, it is the way those elections have been carried on in the two new provinces. The speech from the Throne says they are the most contented people in the world. I take issue with that statement. I had an opportunity of being in those provinces prior to the election, and I make bold to say that if the voice of the people of Saskatchewan had received a fair expression at the polls, Mr. Haultain would