

claims to be a British subject must see the impropriety of inserting such words in this statute. I observe again the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) laughing when I used the words 'British subject.'

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I ask the hon. gentleman to recall that statement entirely. I think my loyalty is quite equal to his.

Mr. BARKER. I said not a word about your loyalty.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. You said that I was sneering when you used the term 'British subject.' I am as proud as any one here of being a British subject, and whilst I have the opportunity, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that if he is to-day a British subject, he owes that privilege to us French Canadians. If the British flag is floating in Canada to-day and if you can keep your two hands to-day upon it—to use a favourite motto of your dear friend who has just left our shores—you owe that to the French Canadians who saved it in 1776 and 1812, and hon. gentlemen opposite, with their tin swords, paper cocked hats and rocking horses are not likely to be the saviours of their country or more necessary to the defence of Canada than we are.

Mr. BARKER. I do not propose to enter into any discussion with the hon. gentleman as regards who saved Canada. I am only speaking for myself as a British subject, and as I would speak if the hon. gentleman had never existed or any person of his race. I am quite as willing as any one to admit French Canadian loyalty, but for my part I deny that my existence as a British subject is due to the hon. gentleman or any of his.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He did not say that. He said that Canada to-day was indebted to the loyalty of French Canadians in 1776 and 1812 for the preservation of the flag over the eastern part of this Dominion and practically over this country, and I say so too.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman can let the hon. member speak for himself.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I can speak for him and for myself as well.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman did not get up to speak for himself but for the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne). I deny what the hon. member for Montmagny has said so far I am concerned.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then you have not read your history aright.

Mr. BARKER. I have read as much history as you have. I am quite willing to admit what French Canadians have done in the past. We are all proud of what they have done in the past, but it is also proper

Mr. BARKER.

that we should not forget what the men in Ontario have done in the past. They have fought and bled for their country just as well as their neighbours, but they do not perhaps boast unnecessarily of it, and I do not think the hon. gentleman need boast too much, either. We are glad to admit and always shall, what the men of Quebec did. We will never deny it. But that does not prevent us to-day from objecting to anything being put in a statute of this Dominion that will at all detract from what may be thought by the world at large of the loyalty of Canadians to the British empire. The moment we put in a statute only unnecessary words such as are proposed by the Minister of Militia, we will leave the world at large to believe that we are departing from that loyalty to the British empire which we all feel so sincerely. I do not want to occupy longer the time of the House, but I say this, that if there were any necessity shown for these words, I would not object to them. I am not disposed to put the government of the day above parliament. I say that the government of the day must be subject to parliament, but when it comes to a question of this nature—and it is only a matter of fifteen days that is in controversy—I say it is ridiculous to stipulate that the Dominion of Canada, the people of Canada, cannot, in some great emergency which alone could call upon the government to send its troops out of this Dominion, allow their government free action during fifteen days to organize the militia of Canada and then call parliament together to pass upon their action. Why, Sir, what do fifteen days or thirty days mean in the calling out of the militia? Before the fifteen days were over the men would hardly be assembled at their headquarters. It would take fifteen days to gather them together at their various barracks and drill-sheds, and it is to be supposed that we must not allow the government of the day to call them out, when within fifteen days after the order goes forth to call them out, the government must call parliament together. Does anybody suppose that there can be any possible danger to the liberties of the people or any danger to the militia of Canada being sent against their will out of the country? Is there any danger that parliament cannot prevent it? Before a man of them could be sent out of this Dominion, parliament would meet and put an end to it, if the government happened to be wrong. But the government do not want to leave it in their own power even to do such a thing, no matter how great the necessity may be. They are not willing that even they or their political opponents should have the power. They want to put it in black and white on the statutes that they cannot do it. Surely we may well protest against that. Surely we may look upon it as offensive to our fellow British subjects