

This paper has been before Canada for the last eight years, and we are told in the province of Quebec that this policy of ours is a new departure. Canada has progressed since 1902. We stated in 1902 that, as Canada advanced in wealth and population, we would advance in our defences. The population of Canada in 1902 was 5,400,000 souls; the population of Canada in 1910 is at least 7,400,000 souls. The revenue of Canada in 1902 was \$58,000,000; the revenue of Canada in 1910 is at least \$100,000,000. We, therefore, think that the time has come when, as was stated in 1902, we should take a step forward, and this is what we are doing. Upon this men can differ, although in my opinion they should not differ; but to tell us that this is something unheard of, a new policy, is simply trifling with common sense. But, Sir, that is not all. They took another position, that the naval service is absolutely uncalled for and unnecessary. Why do we ask parliament to vote for this naval service? It is simply because it is a necessity of our condition and the status we have reached as a nation. Do these gentlemen forget that, as I stated a moment ago, the revenue of Canada is to-day \$100,000,000, and the population over 7,000,000? Do they forget that our country extends from one ocean to the other, and from the American boundary to the Arctic ocean, not on the map only but in actual and ever-increasing settlements? Do they forget that there are growing up on the Pacific coast, cities fast approaching in strength and wealth, eastern cities, that Vancouver to-day has a population of 100,000, that Victoria has a population of 40,000? Do they forget that Prince Rupert is also fast advancing to the front? Do they forget that we are going to build a railway from the interior to Hudson bay? Do they forget that we have gold mines under the Arctic circle? Do they forget that Canada is expanding like a young giant, simply from the pressure of the blood in its young veins? Are we to be told under such circumstances that we do not require a naval service? Why, Sir, you might just as well tell the people of Montreal, with their half million population, that they do not need any police protection.

But that is not all, there is something coming yet, and the position is taken by gentlemen on the other side of the House, speaking in the province of Quebec, that we are not to risk one man or one dollar for the maintenance, the preservation of British supremacy on the high seas. We took the position last year that we should endeavour and we would endeavour to maintain British supremacy on the high seas. We are told in the province of Quebec that we are not to risk one dollar or one man in order to carry out this object. Sir, I have only to say

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

this, that this service will not be compulsory. No one on the other side of the House, no one in any part of the country will be bound to serve in this navy of ours. It will be the free will of any body who wishes to risk his life for his King—it is his privilege, and who will deny it to him? Those who object will not have to lift a finger if that fleet is called out. Their part will be simply to enjoy the security, the ease, the comfort, gained for them by the sacrifice of other and better men. We are told that we should not risk one dollar for such a purpose. Sir, if it be the will and wish of the parliament of this country that this navy of ours should engage in war, whose liberty will be affected by it, whose right jeopardized, whose privilege interfered with? This is a constitutional country and the majority have the right to speak and to dispose, and it is the part of the minority to agree and to accept, unless, of course, rights, privileges and liberties are interfered with; but there is no question in this policy that any man's liberty will be interfered with or his rights endangered.

There will be Canadians of French descent in that fleet. And if, which God forbid, this fleet should ever engage in war, my hope is—nay my certainty is—that these men will fight for the King of England, as their ancestors fought against the King of England when under the gallant Montcalm they repelled attack after attack, when, in the summer of 1759, they kept at bay for three long months on the rock of Quebec the flower of the British army and the flower of the British navy under the command of the young hero, Wolfe. Later, on this same rock of Quebec, they fought for the King of England against American invasion. And, still later, on the banks of the Chateauguay river, they fought under that true soldier, Salaberry, to keep the flag of England floating over their homes. All these many events have had their part in making my country what it is. And now, when I review the long conflicts between the French and the English, I follow the events without any sense of shame or humiliation. For history attests that my ancestors fought with all the prowess of their race, a prowess equal to that of their opponents; and, if they lost, they lost because England was at that time under the leadership of one of the ablest men of that generation, the first William Pitt, whereas France was under the influence of the King's mistress. My ancestors lost on that occasion, but it simply transferred their allegiance from one sovereign to another. They lost in the final the battle, but they did not lose anything of their independence, of their liberty, of their rights and privileges; and to-day the sun in his daily career