

the party he leads. A little later in his speech he quoted from the Saturday Review in reference to certain action taken by the Opposition in the British Parliament, principally by Lord Curzon, Lord Selborne and Mr. Bonar Law. Without reading the whole of the quotation, I would like to read one or two passages. Referring to the task of an Opposition, it said:

In time of war this task mainly resolves itself into finding the right men for the work in hand, and in securing that they shall have all the support they require in material and in authority. . . . The Opposition is bound to reserve to itself the right to question the Government, to watch closely and perpetually its political conduct of the war, to express any misgiving or disagreement it may feel frankly and distinctly.

I take this extract from an article in the Evening Journal, which my right hon. friend commended:

When the Imperial Parliament met in November, "this," said Premier Asquith, "is not a proper time for dealing with any matter of domestic politics," and the view he thus expressed was taken willingly by both sides.

The article then refers to Mr. Austin Chamberlain's conduct and co-operation with the Government, and maintains that, although Mr. Austin Chamberlain could not approve in principle the financial arrangements made by the Government, he co-operated before these were made, and although he dissented from some of them, he expressed in the House his determination loyally to co-operate for the general purposes of the war. The article goes on to say:

Mr. Bonar Law held as an exception that every member and every newspaper had a right to attack any member of the government who might be doing his work inefficiently. And nobody questioned that.

These were the principles laid down and approved by my right hon. friend.

He appealed also to the practice in Great Britain which has been so generously and strikingly exemplified in the last eight months. All questions of domestic policy which had divided the parties on opposite sides and which had been the subject of dispute, have been, both by the Opposition and by the Government, tabooed from Parliament since the opening of the war. Those were very vital and disturbing questions, and they were pursued in some cases with an eagerness and a thoroughness, if not with an animosity, which have seldom been witnessed in the British Parliament. When, however, the war broke out, those domestic questions were laid aside. You do not see John Redmond occupying the platforms of the United Kingdom discussing the ques-

tion of the Ulsterman and the Nationalist. That question has also been laid aside, and John Redmond has used his activities in going up and down through his native Ireland and other parts of the United Kingdom speaking in favour of the enlistment of Irishmen and their co-operation in the war. Another question was the Welsh Disestablishment Bill. That also was fought with great keenness and some acerbity. That has been absolutely laid aside. Non-conformists and Established churchmen have agreed that, while this war is on, that question shall not lead even to discussion, and certainly not to estrangement between the parties. Mr. Bonar Law and those who worked with him were very strongly of the opinion that a change was advisable in the fiscal system of Great Britain. That question has been fought for many years. It was still a live question at the beginning of the war, and it divided both parties very clearly and very definitely; but, since the war broke out, that too has been laid aside, and Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Austin Chamberlain co-operate most heartily in every effort of the Government, while reserving to themselves the absolute right to criticise the political conduct of the Government so far as it relates to the war and what results from the war. The domestic questions which generally divide people have been laid upon the shelf. They have not been brought down since the 4th day of August, and they are reposing on that shelf now.

At our special session of Parliament, my right hon. friend took that same ground. A Bill was brought down to provide \$50,000,000 for the war. We raised a certain amount which was to be contributory to the war fund, and we did it by the old method which has been followed in Canada since Confederation; we placed certain tariff rates of excise and customs on various articles, and we made some changes in other rates. My right hon. friend acquiesced in our action, and his party with him. Whilst they criticised some of the items and gave some good advice, they did not divide the House; they did not prolong the discussion. We come up to this year. What has happened since last session? Is not the course taken by my right hon. friend absolutely contrary to that which has been pursued in the British House of Commons; absolutely contrary to the course which he and his party pursued last year on the war vote and on the means of raising the war vote? If my right hon. friend was right last year, is he right this year? If he appealed last

1915
(118)
108262