

carrying chips on their shoulders and raising a hue-and-cry about something which is not really in issue. I submit that when we have furnished all the money and all the men necessary to do our part in securing the triumph of British arms, we shall have done all that can be expected of us. Perhaps I should not say "expected of us," as that would imply that we are a sort of side-issue and that our responsibilities in this matter are merely secondary. We are an important part of one great Empire. As such, we are expected to do our duty by our own country as well as by the great Empire of which we form a part; therefore, there lays upon us in greater measure the responsibility of carrying out all the purposes which we had in view when we took steps to do our part in bringing this conflict to a successful issue.

We shall come out of this war with a more united Empire than we 10 p.m. ever had before; with the different dominions and nations of which it is composed more consolidated and more in sympathy each with the other than ever they were before; with the bonds uniting Canada with the Mother Country stronger and firmer than ever they were before. If any evidence is required to prove that Canada is faithful to her trust in this regard, it may be given in the words of Marshall Ney, who, when he was blamed by Napoleon for unfaithfulness in some of his later battles, said: "We have been faithful; the bones of Frenchmen, scattered from the sands of Egypt to the snows of Russia, prove our fidelity." So we say: We are faithful to the Crown; the bones of Canadians scattered from South Africa to the snows of Russia prove the fidelity of our people.

It was pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) the other evening that there is a clear distinction between the policy of the Government and the manner in which it is proposed to be carried out. We are at one with the Government as to the policy of giving every possible support to the Mother Country, but we reserve the right to criticise the manner in which that policy is proposed to be carried out. For precedents in parliamentary matters I presume we are safe in looking to the Mother Country. There is no question as to the desire of both parties in the Imperial House of Commons to do all that can be done to bring the war to a successful conclusion. The following extract from a Canadian

newspaper deals with the attitude of the Opposition in the British House of Commons so far as their reception of the Government's policy is concerned:

There seems to be a disposition on the part of the Government at Ottawa, and more particularly its newspaper supporters, to resent any criticism of the policy or administration of the Government, and to regard it as a violation of the truce. This is an unreasonable attitude to assume.

In England although there has been the heartiest and closest co-operation between the parties, the Government does not regard its acts as sacrosanct. In his speech at the opening of Parliament, Mr. Bonar Law, leader of the Opposition, asserted his right to criticise the acts and policy of the Government, and Mr. Asquith promptly acknowledged the right of the Opposition to do so. He said, that "faced as we have been, and faced as we are, with all the responsibilities and cares which are almost unexampled in their complexity, and in their magnitude, we welcome the fullest criticism and we know that we shall receive the co-operation of the House of Commons." That is the only true attitude to take.

That, as I understand it, is the position we are taking in this House. The position of the Opposition here is the same as the position of the Opposition in the Mother Country, and I am sure that the hon. Premier and every other member of the Government and all of their supporters must, if they want to be fair to us on this side of the House, understand our criticism in that way.

Having cleared the ground so far as the position of those I represent and my own position is concerned, I leave myself absolutely free to consider the methods by which the present Minister of Finance expects to gather in the money that is necessary for carrying on the operations of this country in connection with the war. I think the hon. minister has contended that this financial burden is not to be very onerous, that it is not to be felt very much by the people of the country. I wish to quote to him the opinions of some financial papers in England, which he will recognize as authorities:

British financial papers are quoted in recent cables as expressing approval of the stamp tax feature of the new Canadian Budget. That is quite natural, for the stamp taxes are a permanent revenue-getting feature in the Old Country. The financial critics, however, are not so complimentary with reference to the increase in the tariff. For instance, the London Economist, which Sir Robert Borden once certified was "the greatest financial journal in the world," says:

"We are strongly of the opinion that this addition to the cost of living in a new country where prices are already very high will cause much hardship and discontent. Many of these taxes are protective, so that the revenue