

countryman, Chary, of Confederation, said to Cartier: 'Let us not give to the world the sorry spectacle of a people deliberately giving up its nationality.'

Sir George Etienne Cartier, the worthy successor of Lafontaine, lifted his noble head and faced his opponents, he entreated his fellow-countrymen to have faith in those entrusted with the destinies of the country. Accordingly the French Canadians relied on him for the protection of their interests, their rights, their institutions their nationality, their tongue and their religion. Cartier showed himself equal to the trust put in him and provided safeguards for his compatriots under the constitution. Cartier was satisfied that we were not strong enough to remain isolated. We needed friends and allies. To-day, as in 1867, we are bound to require advice and assistance from men of other nationalities and speaking a different language, but who work hand in hand with us towards the accomplishment on Canadian soil of this work of moral and material progress. Statesmen, relying on the vast intelligence of the Prime Minister of Canada, call on him to-day to help us in securing the protection of the rights of the minority and of the rights of the French language. I shall not under such circumstances abandon a man who is following in the footsteps of Baldwin and Macdonald, and is intent on rendering full justice to our race.

I am glad to give my vote in support of this contribution Bill, knowing that in taking this position I am helping to maintain harmony which should exist between the various races inhabiting this country. When a new country, replete with varied and abundant natural resources, is day by day, through the development of its resources and the extension of its markets, occupying a more and more important place in the thoughts of civilized nations, she must necessarily, as a result of her economic expansion, take a wider outlook, accept a larger share of responsibility.

In this House we should all be co-workers, we should all have the same love of country, the same regard for duty, the same spirit of sacrifice. I would not consider that I am playing the part of a patriot if I called on my fellow-countrymen to condemn the wise and far-seeing policy of the Conservative party.

On February 7, my friend from Victoria, N.B., stated: 'The Conservative party is not a progressive party.' That is unfair. Since 1854, the history of the Conservative party has been closely interwoven with that of Canada's unceasing advance. The Conservative party has built up the edifice of Confederation, and ensured Canadian unity. The Conservative party has opened to civilization the western country, where lands are so fertile that one might think they are impregnated with the sweat of our forerunners and the blood of our

martyrs. We have created a whole system of transportation to assist in the development of the country. The Conservative party has built our great national railway, the Canadian Pacific. In 1879, it framed and launched the National Policy, destined to develop in wonderful fashion our agriculture, our commerce and our industry. And to-day, Canadians of all provinces, and especially French Canadians, are bound to second the endeavours of statesmen who have undertaken to consolidate the imposing structure whose foundations the fathers of Confederation laid down in 1867.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Some complaint has been made from this side of the House during the course of the present debate with regard to the lack of speech on the part of our friends on the Government side. I think, however, it will be agreed that, after the experience of to-night and last night, the judgment of the hon. gentleman who is in control of the Government party, when he decided that silence was better than speech, was good. The evidence is that the party had a very much better case by saying nothing, or when they said nothing, than they have after the speeches of to-night and last night. There is, however, an evident excuse for the address of to-night, that we must say did not exist last night.

We are here, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the amendment moved by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turiff) on the second reading of the Naval Bill, an amendment which calls for a redistribution of seats and an election, before this measure is disposed of. It would be idle to conceal the fact that this is a most serious proposition. A request that a measure shall be held over from one Parliament to another is only justified if the measure is of first importance, and if there are other conditions which enforce the requirement.

I wish to deal particularly to-night with the demand for a redistribution of seats prior to an election, rather than with the merits of the Bill. At the same time it is necessary, in order to justify such an important delay, to say a word or two in regard to the principles of the measure before the House, and the reasons that we have for objecting to it so strongly. First, I wish to draw attention to the position of the Government in regard to this matter. The Government took office in October, I think on the 10th of October, 1911, and without any delay they proceeded to a reversal of the naval policy of the previous Government. They had no hesitation in cancelling the contracts that were ready to be signed for the construction of a Canadian fleet. They had no hesitation in making declarations, both before the meeting of Parliament, and afterwards, that they intended to reverse the policy that had been adopted by the previous Parliament, and under the