

year to the practice in the British House of Commons and if he appeals to it this year—by Caesar let him be judged; for he appeals to Caesar—and I do not think the judgment will be lenient to him from that judge, namely, the practice of the British House of Commons.

Therefore, the first point I wish to draw to the attention of my right hon. friend and his party is that they have departed from the ground which they took last year. They have departed from the practice which they last year commended by their lips and by their practice. This year they have adopted a contrary practice. The country will form its own judgment on that action. That is why I said that my right hon. friend—for whatever reasons he made his decision, by whatever pressure or whatever prospect he was induced to make such a decision—hesitated before he made it, and felt a little troubling of his conscience; and therefore his apology, somewhat lengthily, as to why he was going to adopt a different line from that which he had adopted before.

My right hon. friend traced the course of the truce, as it was called, and commended himself for having kept it. It is a truce which was established not by writings, nor as the result of negotiations or conferences, but which arose out of the spirit and wish of the people at large of both political opinions. It has been fairly well kept. My right hon. friend and his party have not appeared on public platforms discussing those domestic questions which divide us. It is true that the little official utterances—official organs shall we call them?—the breathing pores for each party, have been issued as usual; and whilst they have been fairly reasonable, they have served to keep the idea that two parties do yet exist and that they have not coalesced on all points. The newspapers, I think, have fairly exemplified the same spirit; and, up to this present debate at least, the same spirit has characterized the doings as well as the feelings of this House.

Now we have a change. I put it to my right hon. friend: is the question which we have been discussing for the last four or five weeks in this House a question of support of the war and of war measures, or has the main body of this discussion gone back to the times of 1878 and traced the history of discussion from that up to the present, in the old, old domestic issue and quarrel that has been on from 1875, and is still on it seems, as to whether protection

or free trade, or reciprocity or any other form of that domestic policy which shall govern our tariff regulations is the best for this country? That is entirely a domestic question; and this amendment on which we are to be called upon to vote is an amendment which affects absolutely and wholly a domestic question, the question of Canada's own tariff.

In the first place, the amendment, which is guarded in its terms, is based upon an artificial definition made by the first speaker on that side in this debate, my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). It is based upon the division said to exist between war necessities in the way of votes of Parliament and what may be called strictly home necessities. The first thing that was done when the basis of the action was laid down was to make an artificial definition—and found an argument upon it—that a certain amount of this money could be designated a war vote, while a certain other portion of it should be designated a vote for home purposes. And hon. gentlemen opposite believe that they would fulfil their whole duty and be consistent with the position taken last year if, having made that artificial definition, they affirmed that they were quite willing to pass everything in connection with that vote, which they define as necessary for war purposes, and quite willing to criticise, and to oppose, and to defeat if possible, the raising of the money, and the methods by which the money was to be obtained, on what they are pleased to call the provisions for home necessities. This amendment states—I am not quoting its exact words, but the amendment itself, the comments upon it by my right hon. friend, and the summary which was given by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) in the presence of his leader, runs about this way:—as to the hundred millions asked for this year, like the fifty millions voted last year, upon that we will raise no discussion, with reference to that we will bring no opposition; we will support the Government so far as that is concerned. As the debate progressed that ground was widened a little, because it was pointed out by the Minister of Finance (Hon. W. T. White) and by others, that the hundred millions did not cover the whole of even what those hon. gentlemen were willing to admit was war vote, that a certain sum would be necessary to pay the interest of the two war votes, and that another sum would be necessary to provide for pensions. And so, in the course