

for each inhabitant, either man, woman or child.

Those hon. gentlemen think nothing of taking away the liberties of the representatives of the people. It would seem as if it was a well determined policy on the part of the Government to rob us one by one of the rights, privileges and liberties granted to us by the Constitution, rights, privileges and liberties for which our forefathers have fought, for which they have even shed their blood, the better to ensure for us the exercise and the possession of them.

After depriving us of freedom of speech, now the Government seeks to despoil us of the power to administer the public funds with the assent of Parliament. And so it was that a few days ago the Highways Bill was put through and also the one granting certain sums of money for agriculture during a certain number of years, the Governor in Council having the exclusive right to control the sums provided in those laws.

Nay, they are even going so far as to refuse to those who have conquered those liberties at so much sacrifice, the pure and legitimate glory that belongs to them. And so it was that, a few days ago, the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes), at the inauguration of an Orange lodge in this very city of Ottawa, has not been ashamed to hurl such epithets as those of 'fools' and 'scoundrels' at the rebels of 1837! those noble-hearted patriots who have conquered the liberties which are so dear to us. Is the hon. Prime Minister prepared to approve such language? Is the hon. Minister of Militia aware that among those fools and scoundrels was Sir George Etienne Cartier, the founder of the Conservative party, and who himself handled a gun at St. Denis?

I have the honour to represent a county which has been the hotbed of that revolt accomplished by those fools and scoundrels. I represent here the descendants of those who have shed their blood for the cause of popular liberty at St. Eustache, at St. Scholastique and at St. Benoit; as those other fools had previously done at St. Denis and at St. Charles, on the Richelieu river. What does the hon. Minister of Militia know of the history of Canada of that time? Does he ignore the 92 resolutions, framed by those very fools and scoundrels? Does he ignore the acts of those Englishmen of Upper Canada, now Ontario, who in 1837-38-39 allied themselves with those fools and scoundrels, as he calls them, the better to claim back those rights which had been taken away from us by the English bureaucracy; rights which had been acknowledged to us by the Treaty of Paris of 1763.

In the face of all those facts, we now see a Government who has come into power under false representations, and with the aid of heterogeneous elements, seeking, through the exercise of its brutal force, to deprive us of those liberties, and seeking, through one of its ministers to tarnish the

glory of those who have conquered for us those liberties. Fools and scoundrels, the heroes of 1837! Fools and scoundrels, those to whose memory a monument has been dedicated on Viger Square, in Montreal, and another in Cote des Neiges cemetery! Fools and scoundrels, all those who have shed their blood for their country! Indeed, fools of that kind are a necessity in the history of a people, but, forsooth! such fools are then called sublime fools.

I will not now discuss the question of emergency; such was the pretext invoked by the hon. Prime Minister, the better to force that law upon us. There is no more talk, to-day, of emergency. The only emergency existing is, for the Conservative party, to emerge from the dead-lock where it has put itself.

All that is only a false pretext, and false pretences we may also call the promises made by the hon. Prime Minister on the 5th of December last, when he gave us to understand that he had the assurance of the British Government that Canada would be represented in the councils of the Empire. All that has been confirmed by the very words of Mr. Harcourt, the Secretary for Colonies.

In the face of that affirmation of the Prime Minister, that Canada would be represented in the councils of the Empire, if those thirty-five millions were voted as an aid to the naval defence of the Empire, this was the statement of Mr. Harcourt:

That the Committee of Imperial Defence is a purely advisory body, and is not, and cannot under any circumstances, become a body deciding on policy, which is and must remain the sole prerogative of the Cabinet, subject to the support of the House of Commons.

So then, emergency is only a mere allegation! Mere allegation also, the representation in the councils of the Empire for the Colonies.

Why then, Mr. Speaker, persist in despoiling us of thirty-five millions for the benefit of England? Why, then, even supposing that there is a necessity for those three dreadnoughts, deny to Canada the advantage and the right to build its own ships? Why should Canada be denied the power and the right to establish a new industry in this country? Why should we deprive our working classes of the benefit of that industry which would be so advantageous especially for the Maritime Provinces, and I might add for the whole country? Why not bring into this country the shipbuilders, great companies as the Vickers-Maxim, the Armstrong, and others which were ready to erect shipyards, here, and which now go to Italy.

Why, on the contrary, bestow our favours on the great English capitalists, the very ones who now stir up and derive profit from jingoism, who raise and spread the German peril, and whose only desire is to get rich at the expense of Canada, of England, and of the other colonies.