

result and that Nationalism has been triumphant when the very thing that the Nationalist adhors is embodied in the Bill and the very thing that he might look upon with favour—a Canadian service—is not included in the Bill? I take exception to the statement, but I am taking my right hon. friend on his own ground. He says that there is no permanent policy, but that it is all contribution. If that is so, however, the antecedents may have been, the Nationalist did not get the victory in this matter.

Sir, you will agree with me that there was some cruelty in these utterances of the Minister of Trade and Commerce; he should have avoided hurting the feelings of his Quebec friends, and might have crowed a little less over his victory. And that is only the beginning. It has been stated by all the ministers that this was only the first step, and that the Government was about to enact a permanent naval policy. The hon. Postmaster General says so himself. I quote his own words from the 'Hansard,' page 1147:

This measure now before the House, coupled with the speech of the leader of the Government, provides for a temporary, preliminary thing.

Elsewhere, at page 1131, I find the following answer of the minister to an inquiry from the hon. representative of St. John:

Mr. PUGSLEY: No Canadian navy?

Mr. PELLETIER: We are preparing for it.

What better authority could I bring forward in support of my contention? I shall now quote from a recent statement of Bonar Law, leader of the Unionist party in Great Britain:

If the Empire, as a whole, is ever to become actually what it is in name, a United Empire, a united nation, it will only be through the establishment of a real federal system within the United Empire, our colonies contributing to the defence of the Empire and participating in the glory of governing the Empire in proportion to their population.

With such a statement before our eyes, have we not reason to believe that there is an agreement between the British Tories and the Canadian Tories, and that this Bill is a step towards that Imperialistic organization so dear to the heart of Mr. Bonar Law?

The Government tells us: our Bill is only a beginning, a first step, a provisional measure; we propose that contribution pending the putting through of a permanent naval scheme. I say we have the right to inquire from the Prime Minister and his colleagues what system they intend imposing on the country. We have the right to insist that they cast aside those diplomatic subterfuges which cannot deceive us, and which seem to me an admission of weakness and helplessness.

That contribution which the Government will not designate under the name of tri-

bute, because it knows how that word would grate on Canadian ears, that contribution would disastrously affect the future destiny of Canada. The argument put forward by the hon. Postmaster General in support of his Bill is not admissible in a Canadian legislature. From the constitutional viewpoint it cannot be defended, and still less from the viewpoint of Canadian interests or of the principles which are at the foundation of responsible Government.

Years of perseverance, of struggles and of wrangling, and the constant and hearty co-operation of the Canadian people with its political leaders, such was the condition of the building up of our constitution and of the Canadian nation. When responsible government was established, the Canadian people became the equal of the British people. The Tories of that period exclaimed wrathfully that the introduction in Canada of popular franchises would lead to the severing of the bonds uniting this country to the Empire. The Tories of to-day contend that the creation of a Canadian navy would give that same result. The clamoring of to-day is not any more justified than the protests of the ultra-loyalists of sixty years ago.

Then Confederation took place, and one of the strongest arguments which was put forward on behalf of the new regime was that it allowed organizing the defence of the country on sea as well as on land. At the time of the memorable debate on Confederation in the united parliament, in 1865, Sir John A. Macdonald exclaimed:

Should we have to fight on our lakes against a foreign foe, we will have the hardy seamen of the lower provinces coming to our assistance and manning our vessels.

On November 23, 1864, another of the fathers of Confederation, the hon. Sir. A. T. Galt, spoke thus at Sherbrooke:

By a union with the Maritime provinces, we should be able to strike a blow on sea, and like the glorious old Mother Country, carry our flag in triumph on the waters of the great ocean.

Later on, at the time of the entrance of British Columbia in the Confederation, Sir George Etienne Cartier, on March 28, 1871, spoke as follows:

I have always contended that a nation in order to be great should have a sea force. Look at Prussia and Russia; their power is very great, but can it be compared with the maritime power of Great Britain?

I challenge the supporters of the debasing policy which is now proposed to us to quote a sentence, a line, a word in the whole of the debates, speeches and conferences which preceded or followed Confederation, showing that any of these great men who were the fathers of Confederation suspected for a moment that this great country of ours would ever be called upon

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska).