

ferently as applying to the same condition of things. I am sorry that I have to ask my hon. friend to brush up his classics. Would he be satisfied with the authority of Sir Walter Scott? Would Sir Walter Scott satisfy his literary aestheticism, or would he be satisfied that Sir Walter was sufficient of a Tory not to harrow his imperial soul? Let me ask my hon. friend, as I said a moment ago, to brush up his classics. Let me ask him to read again 'Quentin Durward' and he will find on the same page Sir Walter Scott using the expression 'sovereign' and 'suzerain' as applying to the same condition of things and to the same man. In the thirty-fifth chapter of 'Quentin Durward' my hon. friend will find that Lady Isabelle, addressing the Duke of Burgundy, uses this language:

'My lord, duke and sovereign,' said Lady Isabelle, summoning up all her courage, 'I observe your Grace's commands, and submit to them.' . . . 'My submission,' she said, 'only respected those lands and estates which your Grace's ancestors gave to mine, and which I resign to the house of Burgundy, if my sovereign thinks my disobedience in this matter renders me unworthy to hold them.'

Again:

'My Lord,' she replied, still undismayed, 'I am before my Suzerain, and, I trust, a just one.'

I think that after this I can be freed from the hypercritical fastidiousness of my hon. friend both in point of philology and imperialism.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you let me see the 'Durward' extract?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. The great mistake which is made by those imperialists of the school of my hon. friend is to confound the condition which exists in Great Britain with that which prevails in the colonies. England belongs to the circle of nations which is known as the European concert, it is one of the four or five nations of Europe that are always watching one another. There are no public works to carry on there, and she can devote herself and her resources to armaments. But, the colonies are not in that condition. Our chief consideration is public works, to develop the resources of our country, and therefore I say that this is a mistake which should not be made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House? They are not the first ones to make that mistake. England made the same mistake in the eighteenth century when she tried to force the American colonies to contribute to her armament by taxation. They protested, but their protests were not heeded. They protested again and at last, though they were a loyal population, they were driven to distraction and they

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

severed the tie that connected them with the mother country. Benjamin Franklin was one of the leaders of the movement in the colonies at that day, yet it is on record that he was a most devoted loyalist. He went to England to try and prevent the mischievous course which was being followed by the British government, but his visit was to no purpose. He was heard before the bar of the House of Commons. There the question was put to him whether or not, in case of war the colonies would contribute to assisting England and this is what he answered:

I do think they would so far as their circumstances would permit. They consider themselves as part of the British empire, and as having one common interest with it. They may be looked on in here (in London) as foreigners, but they do not consider themselves as such. They are zealous for the honour and prosperity of this nation; and while they are well used, will always be ready to support it, as far as their little power goes.

If I quote this language, it is not because there is complete analogy between the conditions which exist to-day in the self-governing colonies of Great Britain and that which existed in her American colonies of that day. There is no danger to-day that England would impose taxation on her colonies without representation, or that her colonies would go into rebellion, but I read this because there are men here, who, like the Bourbons, have forgotten nothing and learned nothing, and who do not appreciate the present conditions existing between England and her colonies.

There is another point to which I should give some attention. Great objection has been taken in the province of Quebec because there is in this Bill a provision, that, in an emergency the Governor in Council may call out the fleet and put it at the disposal of the War Office. Section 18 is in these words:

In case of an emergency the Governor General in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

Section 19 is in these words:

Whenever the Governor in Council places the naval service or any part thereof on active service, as provided in the preceding section, if parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall issue for a meeting of parliament within fifteen days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.