

South African war, were we disloyal when, in spite of trying circumstances, we sent to South Africa the young men of this country to fight the battles of Greater Britain? Are we disloyal to-day when we are the first in the history of this Dominion to give His Majesty the King a navy, as the Conservative party of old gave Her Majesty the Queen an army? Mr. Speaker, let us not talk of loyalty, but let us practice loyalty. We are denounced as ultra loyal in the county of Jacques Cartier, and as ultra disloyal in the county represented by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule). In the province of Quebec, already, my hon. friend and his allies have started meetings of indignation against what they are pleased to call the great treason of the Liberal leader. The Blue press, which has been quoted this evening by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), is stirring up the worst prejudices of our people against this policy. The leader of the Liberal party is represented as sacrificing his compatriots, the French Canadians, on the altar of Moloch, meetings have been organized and resolutions have been passed protesting against the navy. Sir, it is the same old story. At the time of the Boer war, these shouts and shrieks were heard, as they were again heard when the Autonomy Bill of 1905 was introduced. But, thank heaven, there is a majority in this country of men of common sense.

I shall not delve into old books, I shall not quote to the House what happened fifty or sixty years or a hundred years ago. The privilege of a reformer is to face every difficulty as it presents itself and it is the beauty of the British constitution, that while it is based on precedents, it adapts itself to every circumstance and difficulty. Sir, why a navy for Canada? Because it is a natural evolution of the country. Take the marvellous increase of our population—thanks to the wise policy of the Liberal party, the population of Canada since 1896 has nearly doubled. Thanks to the Liberal party—thanks to Providence first and to the Liberal party afterwards.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There has been an enormous increase in our natural wealth. I have it from the hon. gentleman who presides over the Census Bureau, the Minister of Agriculture, that at the time of the next census, a year from now, the population of this Dominion will be nearer 8,000,000 than it will be 7,500,000. Our vast territories have become the refuge, the happy refuge, of thousands and hundreds of thousands of settlers. Do not our hon. friends opposite, who I verily believe are as patriotic as we are on this side of the House, not agree that it is good policy to instil

into the minds and hearts of the new settlers who come from the United States, the idea that this country should defend and protect herself? The financial position of this country is extremely sound. As was stated this afternoon by the Prime Minister, the revenue of this year has reached the high-water mark of over \$100,000,000; surpluses have followed each other since 1897, since we established the British preference. Our total trade, which in 1896 was \$249,000,000, has reached the enormous figure of \$750,000,000. The savings banks deposits, which in 1896 were only \$250,000,000 have reached in 1909 the sum of nearly \$800,000,000. The production of western grain in 1900 was only 32,000,000 bushels; in 1909 it reached 330,000,000 bushels. The mineral production of this country has also far exceeded our expectations. So I am not amiss when I say that our population has doubled, that our wealth has trebled, that our trade and our industry have increased by leaps and bounds since 1896. To use the language of the Toronto 'News,' I can say:

Unexampled prosperity has dawned upon this confederacy. Our foreign trade surpasses \$700,000,000 annually, our railway mileage is enormous, our prairie lands are filling up rapidly, our financial institutions are strong and vigorous, our industries are growing enormously.

From an economic point of view the Dominion of Canada of 1896 is represented by the value of two Dominions of Canada. It is not, I suppose, contrary to any constitutional doctrine of which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is such a brilliant exponent, to say that Canada has become the leading overseas dominion of the British empire. We make and unmake our tariffs; we control our defences; we practically make our own treaties. Not later than the first of February last came in force the Franco-Canadian treaty, which was negotiated through the diplomacy of our own Canadian statesmen, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Sir, I can repeat the words of the right hon. the Prime Minister, who said in the presence of His Majesty the King in 1897: Canada is a nation within the empire. There was no question at the time as to whether or not the Prime Minister had used the words equivocally, whether he recognized the sovereignty or the suzerainty of the King. On this point let me say one word. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has been a professor of constitutional law. It so happens that in the same university I myself was a professor of the history of law, and I happen to know the difference between suzerainty and sovereignty. In England, in France, in Germany, the King is the suzerain—why? Because they were feudal countries. Under the feudal system, barons, mar-