

San Domingo.—1 gunboat. Population, 610,000.

Sweden.—15 armoured cruisers. Policy, fortification works to last twelve years. Population, 5,500,000.

Sir, if we were to follow the advice of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier we would have the province of Quebec in the position in which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), a few years ago, said England was: in a splendid isolation; we would have the province of Quebec in this confederation, where all of the other English-speaking provinces on this question are one, although differing in details, we would have the province of Quebec in a position of splendid isolation.

Mr. Speaker, I am against the splendid isolation of the French Canadian race. I say to my hon. friend and to his ally, the ex-member for Labelle, Mr. Bourassa, one of the most talented men that the French Canadian race ever produced, that in propounding this policy of splendid isolation for the French Canadians in this confederation of ours, they are not true to the traditions of their race. No, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier does not respond to the national traditions of the race which he and I represent. He does not even respond to the political traditions of the French Conservative party of old. Let me give a few glimpses of the history of the province of Quebec. My hon. friend seems to infer that we, in Quebec, are naturally against any movement in favour of either a militia or a navy. In 1759, when the last act took place of that sombre drama on the Plains of Abraham, my forefathers passed under another domination. Under the French regime our forefathers had not known what liberty and free institutions were. We were governed by a bureaucracy and there was no such thing as parliamentary institutions. But, as Aeneas came from Troy to Rome and brought with him his customs and his laws, so, the British and the Scotch grenadiers, who vanquished the French on the Plains of Abraham, brought with them, so to speak, the British constitution and all that it implies. We were left a few thousand French, led by the Roman Catholic clergy, and abandoned by the seigneurs, who at that time returned to France. We were left a minority of 60,000 people on the two shores of the St. Lawrence, almost lost in the Anglo-Saxon continent of North America. We would have been submerged if the British parliament of 1774 had not, under the most generous impulse, given to the French Canadian Roman Catholic minority, its laws, its language, its customs and its religious freedom. Does not my hon. friend, whose allies are invoking the Monroe doctrine as a protection for us in case of attack, re-

member having read in the history of the thirteen colonies, that one of the grievances adduced by the revolutionists against the mother country was that very fact that the mother country had given the French Canadians and the Roman Catholics their religious freedom, their French laws and their national customs? In the light of history, would my hon. friend believe that if we were once launched on the American ocean, our laws, our schools, our usages and customs would be protected by the United States Congress? Let him remember the history of Louisiana. There was in Louisiana a French minority. It had the civil laws of France as we have the civil laws of France embalmed in the Canadian statutes. It professed the Roman Catholic faith. Let him go to Louisiana to-day; let the clergy; let the bishops of the province of Quebec go to Louisiana and what will they find? They will find many French names in the directories, but they will hear very little French spoken. They will see that while twenty or twenty-five years ago, French was taught in the schools, to-day there is only one language, and that is the English language. French laws were preserved. They are in their code, but they are printed in English and before the courts they are cited in the English language only. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that we had nothing to care about British supremacy, that if perchance British supremacy was a bygone thing, what we had gained, we would still keep. I say to my hon. friend that his language does not voice the sentiment of the far-seeing men of his race, and of his province. It is, on the contrary, of the most vital interest to the French Canadian citizen, whether he be a layman or a priest, whether a priest or a bishop, to stand up for the maintenance of British supremacy in order to preserve the rights, the privileges and the franchises which were obtained from the British parliament in 1774. My hon. friend says that we owe nothing to British statesmanship. As a Liberal, as a Canadian, I cannot forget that it is due to Charles James Fox, to the great Pitt himself, that the Canadians of 1774 secured what I have called on many occasions, the Magna Charta of the province of Quebec. What we obtained in 1774 was secured again under the constitution of 1791 and a few illustrations will show that the role of the French Canadian clergy has always been one of grateful and loyal adhesion to the British Crown just on account of the privileges enjoyed under it. What did Mgr. Briand, Bishop of Quebec, say? In May, 1775, at the time of the American invasion, he used this language:

The singular favour and kindness with which we have been governed by his most