

expense, but these things get into 'Hansard,' and into the public press, and are read seriously, and for that reason we do not like them to be said. The hon. gentleman said also that this opposition had no practical head on its shoulders. Well, it seems to me the hon. member had better ask himself again, who has been doing the practical business in this parliament since February 6? He had better look through 'Hansard' and see who has initiated the legislation, and he will find that on nearly every question of public importance the opposition has taken the initiative, and the government has opposed, and has afterwards given in, as they did on the binder twine question. When hon. members opposite make assertions of this kind, which are not based on the facts, but are mere bluff, I warn them, be they young members or old ones, there will always be a member on this side ready to get up and point out what the actual facts are.

Now I wish to speak for a moment in regard to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). The other night that hon. gentleman declared that he was a protectionist in theory and in practice, if he could get the practice. Well, the practice is on this side of the House, and when the vote is taken on this question, I should think he would stand up and vote with us, and get the benefit of the practice of protection as well as the theory. He sits behind this government, and he declared at the end of his speech that he was going to vote with the government; yet, he is a protectionist, and he thinks this government is a revenue tariff government. The hon. gentleman declared himself to be a protectionist, and he knows that we on this side of the House have been consistent protectionists; he knows we are protectionists to-day, as we always have been, and he knows that our record has been to carry out, when in power, the pledges and promises we have made when out of power.

The hon. gentleman said that although he is a protectionist he will vote against this resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way to convince new members—if I may be allowed to speak for the new members—upon this side as to what their duty is. We would prefer to take the advice of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, and state in clean cut language what we mean, and if what we mean is the same as what is expressed in this resolution, then vote for it. I have no faith in the man who says: I do not believe in a free trade or a revenue tariff, and I do believe in protection, but as this resolution, which meets my views in favour of protection, does not come from my side of the House I cannot support it. I will vote for a thing I do not believe in and against that which I do believe in, in order to be upon the same side as the government. If this is the sort of argument used in the hopes of convincing this House—

and I see no reason why we should debate in this House at all, unless in the hope of convincing some of those who differ from us that we are right and they are wrong—if that is the sort of argument to which the hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) resorts, let me tell him that he will have to adopt an altogether different style of tactics, if he expects to convince us that when we want protection we must not vote for the resolution which proposes that policy.

Let me now, Mr. Speaker, discuss for a moment the question of British preference as explained by the government. In his budget speech, the hon. the Finance Minister said that we could not obtain from Great Britain the preference we wanted now, but that when we could get such a preference we will have it. It is no doubt not very difficult to understand that when we can get a thing we will have it. Any school boy would know that when we can get a thing which is good for us, we will very likely take it. Yet that was the summing up of this great policy of the government, as I understood the Finance Minister. We cannot obtain a preference because Mr. Chamberlain will not give it to us, but we are in hopes that by saying to him, we do not want it and are not going to make any row, if we do not get it, he will end by giving it to us, and as soon as he will give it to us, we will have it. That is the sum and substance of the Finance Minister's programme.

Well, what is the other side of the question? We, on this side, say: We can have it if we show the British government that we are entitled to get it and are resolved to get it. We contend that we can get it if we argue our case fairly, and that we could have got it, instead of the Cobden medal, had the right hon. gentleman asked for it. But the right hon. gentleman, not only did not ask for it, but declared that he would not. The people of this Dominion to-day, however, are asking for it; and in reply to this demand, hon. gentlemen opposite say it would be a good thing to get, but we will make no effort to get it. I suppose we ought to give them some credit for not saying that such a preference would be a curse and for not imagining that the people are so gullible as to suppose that it would be a serious injury to get something so evidently to our advantage. If there is an independent man on the government benches, if there is a man not hide-bound in his politics, if any gentlemen on the other side are still susceptible to reason, why not, in the name of common sense, vote for the resolution of the leader of the opposition? What matter whether the resolution comes from a Grit or a Tory, if it be in the interests of the country? Surely, in this parliament, the highest deliberative body in the country, we should do business on business principles just as it would be done in some school section or some little factory employ-

Mr. LANCASTER.