

quises and counts had become very powerful, until in France for example, the day came when Louis XIV. became the suzerain of all his grand vassals, the barons, marquises and counts. So it was in England and in Germany. It is silly indeed to pick a quarrel over the use of the word suzerain or the word sovereign. Sir, we are a nation within the empire, and why I pray, should we not have a navy of our own? Does any one dispute the right of this country to have a militia of her own? If there are objections to a Canadian navy, are there not also objections to a Canadian militia? My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier excited the merriment of his friends opposite when he opened his remarks; but I must say that when he concluded it looked as if the other side of the House was rather gloomy. Let me say to my hon. friend that he has not played the game fair. He has represented the thousands and hundreds of thousands of readers of the daily press in the province of Quebec as an ignorant lot. He insinuates that we, on this side of the House, have been bluffing the electorate of the province of Quebec, and he has quoted partially from a leader published in 'Le Canada' newspaper. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had time to translate that leader. Not a word can be found in it that is a reproach to the man who wrote it. It is ably written, and to every word in it any man could subscribe. It is written in French, and my hon. friend translated it into English only partially. I hope that some of my friends who will speak on this question will read the translation of this article. It is headed 'Les Quatre Manieres de Voir,' 'The Four Different Views,' and explain the policy of the Liberal party, as voiced this afternoon by the leader of the government. The editor states that in case of an emergency it is in the power of the Canadian parliament to say whether or not the navy can be used by His Majesty the King. My hon. friend excited hilarity of that side of the House on the word 'may.' 'May,' he said with emphasis, the Canadian government 'may' lend that tin-pot navy to the King of England. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was in the House some years ago when the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) introduced his Bill to revise the Militia Act. Did he play with the words used in that Bill? Had he scrutinized the various clauses of that very important Bill he would have read a clause quite similar to the clause referred to. Clause 69 of the Militia Act reads:

The Governor in Council may place the militia or any part thereof on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada for the defence thereof at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mark well: not the House of Commons but the traitors, who compose the cabinet. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we traitors may, if we so choose, lend the militia of Canada to the King of Great Britain. Has my hon. friend read that Act? Did he move any amendment when it was proposed in the House of Commons? Did he notice it? Was he absent? I believe he was not present and judging by the language he used this evening, to say the least, he was deficient in his duty.

Sir, it is of this argument of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, as regards the words: 'They may lend the navy to the King of England' that we shall hear in the present debate, particularly from my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), thundering denunciations, because forsooth the Canadian parliament is to meet and to deliberate whenever an emergency arises. But, Sir, this principle is in the Militia Act: parliament, according to clause 71, must meet when there is an emergency and when our militia is on active service. There are things which are said in the province of Quebec, and others in the province of Ontario and thus, various comments are made on the clauses of the Militia Act. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier referred to the heroes of 1837 and 1838. He appealed to the French Canadian members in the House of Commons, he, the descendant of one who was fighting against the patriots of 1837. In his historical reminiscences, has the hon. gentleman forgotten that the father of the Militia Act was a great leader and a knight at that, of the French-Conservative party, Sir George Etienne Cartier? Has he forgotten that Sir George Cartier was on the battlefields at St. Charles and St. Denis with the grandfather of the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who signed with his own blood the Magna Charta of not only the French Canadians but also of the English-speaking Canadians of this country? Sir, the Thirty Sevensers as they call them in the county of York, did not fight only in the Queen's bush of Quebec, but fought also for the same cause not very far from Toronto. But this is not only a question of sentiment, it is above all a question of business and hard facts and I hasten to revert to hard facts and business. Why should we not have a navy as we have an army? En passant, it is well to remember, that our militia force is not the skeleton of an army. I have heard more praise to the Canadian army during my peregrinations abroad, and from higher authorities than my friend suspects, certainly more praise than I have heard falling from the lips of my hon. friends opposite. Who were the men who thus praised the