

are not numerous, but perhaps they may be—that if they imagine for a moment that in this scheme of preferential trade, militarism, imperialism, or call it what they will, if they imagine that there is the slightest intention on the part of any member of this House, especially of any Conservative, in this House to interfere to the extent of one iota with the rights or liberties of any Canadian, they never made a greater mistake. But what we on this side cannot understand is this: If England is willing to make a bargain with us for our mutual advantage, why is it that we, a people who are trading every day and making money by trading, should not discuss the terms of that bargain? Why should not our Prime Minister sit down with the representatives of the mother country and at least try to make the best bargain that can be made in the interest of Canada, when the possibilities are so tremendous? If we fail, there is no loss; and if we succeed the gain is incalculable. And so I hope that, among the matters to be brought before this House even though not mentioned in the speech from the Throne, will be a resolution that will unmistakably declare the feeling of Canada in favour of inter-imperial preferential trade. I do not wish to speak at any length on the subject brought up by the hon. member for Labelle yesterday. I am sorry he is not in his place at this moment. It seems to me that it would be unfortunate, perhaps, if too much were said on the subject on which he spoke so eloquently, and, in some respects so well. The hon. gentleman, if I understood his speech—and I have since read his remarks in ‘Hansard’—seemed to me to be very much in the position of the class of people known as ‘Little Englanders’ in the mother country. I must not be taken as speaking contemptuously of my Reform friends, when I speak of the politics of the hon. gentleman on this question as appearing to me to be parish politics. In one passage he said, almost with a whine, that he would not let any one trample on the French Canadians of the province of Quebec. As if any one entertained the slightest intention of trampling on these worthy fellow citizens of ours. I have always held an entirely different view of the people of the province of Quebec from that of the hon. member for Labelle, and that opinion was not changed by the hon. gentleman’s speech. Let me show what is the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Labelle no longer ago than yesterday. He wants the people of Quebec to remain as they are without contributing to the maintenance of the empire, without allowing the people of this country, even if they are willing, to assist the empire, without assuming any obligation or responsibility of any kind whatever in relation to the empire—and the moment it pays us better we are to leave the empire and go off by ourselves, or join the United States, or do whatever we like. Is that a view of national life that

Mr. NORTHROP.

will appeal to any reasonable man? I venture to say that it is not a view of national life that will appeal to the majority of the people in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman said, and said truly that there was a time when Canada was saved to the empire by the loyalty, fidelity and courage of the people of the province of Quebec. No one is more ready to admit that than are we on this side. But I will go further than the member for Labelle, and will say that in my opinion, when these men went forth to conquer and to hold this country for the empire, they did it not merely to hold so much land for themselves and their children, but because they appreciated the terms on which they had entered the British empire, they were grateful for what had been conceded to them, they were loyal subjects of the empire. They fought not only as Canadians, but as British subjects; and they won not only for themselves but for the British empire. Why, Sir, in that city of Quebec which must be well known to my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa), is one of the best national monuments that could be found to teach English speaking and French speaking Canadians how they should live. In that city of Quebec, where, on the day of the conquest, the gallant leaders of both sides fell, there is a monument erected to the memory of both. Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual to erect a monument to a victorious chief, but where else throughout the world will you find a monument inscribed, as this one is, on one side to the memory of Wolfe, the victor, and on the other to the memory of Montcalm, the vanquished. And their epitaph is there:

Mortem virtus communem
Faniam historia
Monumentum posteritas dedit.

Their heroism gave them a common death; history has given a common fame; and posterity has erected a monument to their joint memory.

That, Sir, exemplifies the principle which, I think, should underlie all the dealings between the French-speaking and the English-speaking citizens of this country. But if hon. gentlemen like our hon. friend from Labelle, speaking as he did in this House yesterday, will suggest that they are standing up to prevent their French-speaking fellow-citizens from being trampled on, is it astonishing that we, from the other provinces, knowing that there is not the slightest ground of suspicion of any attempt on our part to trample on them, cannot but feel suspicious that there is some ulterior object to be gained other than appears on the face of the words uttered? As this matter has come before the House, perhaps hon. members will pardon me if I give in a few words the reasons why I think we should have no difficulty in overcoming a race feeling like this if it exists. There may have been a time, as intimated by the hon. member for La-