

when he formed his cabinet, he took into it a gentleman who was before then and who has been since an open advocate on all occasions of the principle of protection. If we are to believe the statements made by that hon. gentleman, when he was taken into the cabinet, it was upon some understanding or arrangement that in the near future legislation would be introduced by the right hon. gentleman tending towards the principles advocated by that minister. Subsequently we found that minister advocating, as he had done before he entered the government, and as I submit he had a perfect right to do, the principles of protection under the arrangement that had been made with him; but we find that the right hon. gentleman was not willing to carry out the promise he had made to his own minister, but played the double act again, and as a result of that duplicity he lost from his cabinet one of the ablest members who has graced it since 1896.

Let me give another illustration. The conduct of the right hon. gentleman was characterized in the same way upon the question of preferential trade. We all know, from his reported speeches delivered during the time he was in England, the position he took upon that question there. We know the speech he made in the city of Toronto when he returned from England, and we recollect the questions that were put to him on that occasion and the answers that he gave. He was charged there with having made speeches in England on that question that were entirely inconsistent with the position that he took before his Toronto audience; and what was his conduct when he was accused in that way? He had the audacity to tell that intelligent audience that when he was speaking in Great Britain, he was only fooling the people there, or, to use his own language, he was only luring them on, thus admitting that he was playing a double game.

Let me proceed a little further in this history. Take the railway policy of the right hon. gentleman, as embodied in the measure brought before this parliament in relation to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. When the right hon. gentleman introduced that Bill into this House, he declared that the agreement made between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was a perfect agreement, and that the Bill he had introduced was one that could not be amended or improved in any particular; and that measure was forced through this House by the power which the right hon. gentleman had behind him. But, Sir, the very same thing characterized his conduct in that important matter as characterized it on the trade question. When it was ascertained that the Grand Trunk Railway Company were not satisfied with the conditions of that agreement, and of that Bill which he had declared to be perfect and unalterable, we find him coming

again to this House and swallowing holus bolus what he had declared, by introducing amendments to that measure—for what purpose? Simply to please the outside influences that were operating upon him. And that was the second occasion on which he refused to listen to the advice of perhaps the ablest minister on that particular subject in his cabinet.

He preferred to ignore the advice given to him by his ministers and to satisfy the outside influence of the Grand Trunk Railway, and upon that second occasion he lost another minister from his cabinet. Let us take another illustration. Look at the position taken by the right hon. gentleman in 1896 upon this very school question. At that time, with all the ability and eloquence at his command, he stood up and proclaimed that the minority of the province of Manitoba should not have remedial legislation at the hands of this government. He was then denying to the people of his own faith, his own church, the rights they were clamouring for. To-day he is making a complete right about face upon that important question. While in 1896 he was declaring hands off Manitoba and that the minority should not have separate schools in that province, you find him to-day just as strongly advocating in just as eloquent and forcible language that this parliament shall for all time to come fasten upon these two new provinces the system of separate schools. Again the right hon. gentleman has been playing a double game. Let me ask me why he is playing this double game? What influence is it that is making him do so? It is certainly not the advice of the one minister who above all others should advise him in this particular instance. No, it is due to a pandering to outside influence and a total disregard of that particular minister to whom he should have listened. And upon this, the third occasion, he has lost the most valuable member in his cabinet. So I might go through almost every branch of the government, nearly every particular measure which has come within the attention of this government since 1896, and draw the very same conclusion I have drawn from these two or three matters to which I have referred the House.

But let us take one more instance. We had in 1902-3 in this country a gentleman, a British subject, a soldier who had brought credit to himself and his country, a man who was sent here as the accredited agent or delegate of the Imperial parliament, a man who was charged with the performance in this country of a very great duty; and when that gentleman undertook to advise this government, his reports are said to have been mutilated or pigeon-holed, his advice is said to have been ignored. That was stated on the floor of this House and not denied, and that gentleman, when he found that he could not get the ear of the government and he could not carry out the important duty which he was charged to perform, took the