

ber for Colchester in regard to proposed legislation—who has said a man required to be an idiot before he could be elected to the British House of Commons. None of us have gone to the point of saying, when it suited our political purposes—our narrow party purposes—that because the British minister thought proper, by his own authority, to call back a subordinate who is under his orders, that he is a coward. We respect ourselves as Canadians, and we respect the British as they should be respected. We know where we stand. We do not make our loyalty to serve our party purposes, ready to put it aside when there is any party advantage to be gained thereby. I do not know that any member of our party belongs to a powerful organization—a so-called religious or social organization—which, according to its Grand Master is essentially a political organization. The predecessor of the present Grand Master used to lecture us in this House, the French Canadians especially, but English speaking members also, upon their loyalty. Yet he once advised a certain element in the United Kingdom to go into rebellion under arms against the authority of the Queen because the laws sanctioned by the Queen did not suit his particular political views.

I thought this amendment was prepared by the government of Canada. I thought the government of Canada knew that it could rely upon the faithful support of its followers upon this occasion. I fail to understand why the government should now stop the passage of this section in order that the extraordinary lights of the opposition—the legal, military and loyalty lights, such as the hon. member of Colchester and the hon. member for North Victoria—might be called to the aid of the government in order that we may have a proper law. I do not know whether I am expressing the sentiments of the Liberal party, but I must say that I do not understand that we have been sent here to be led by the hon. member for Victoria and the member for Colchester. We have been sent here to stand by the government and the Liberal party as long as they stand by Liberal principles and as long as they have faith in the support of their followers. But I may say to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and to the government, that if we have reached the point where they must get their inspiration and direction from what I may call the narrowest section of the Tory party, then, I think there will be much difference in the sentiment of the Liberals when the next election comes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am delighted that we have at last unmasked the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He has shown himself in his true light—

Mr. BOURASSA. Exactly. What I have always been—a Liberal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He has been masquerading up and down this country, and it is an open secret that the boast has been made that these objectionable words had been put into this clause at the instigation of the hon member for Labelle, and that this is the condition upon which he allowed the Bill to be brought before the House.

Mr. BOURASSA. I deny that absolutely. I read the clause for the first time in the draft Bill. I never saw the Minister of Militia about it. I had several conversations over other clauses of the Bill, but not over this one. The hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) must take those words back.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I wish to endorse absolutely what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa). I never consulted him, and he never made a suggestion to me with reference to this clause.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The statement has been current that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) was behind the scenes in this matter. Did the hon. minister draw that clause himself? No, he did not.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is obliged to accept the statement of the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let me inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) that I have not disputed the word of the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is bound to accept the statement made by the hon. gentleman for Labelle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have nothing to do with his statement. I make the statement that the report is current.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) must accept the statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will not accept the statement; it has nothing to do with what I said. I say the report is current in this country. Why, it has been published in the papers throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) must know the rule—that when a statement is made in reference to another hon. gentleman and that hon. gentleman denies it, that denial must be accepted by the hon. gentleman. Whether he believes it to be true or not is another question—but he must accept it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will state to the committee that he accepts—