

what France did, in retaining Savoy, as a compensation for the help tendered in 1860 to Italy in the fight against Austria. That is also what England has done in obtaining the transfer of the major part of the Suez Canal stock and practically getting the control over Egypt after taking a hand in righting the finances of the country rather upset through the bungling of some khedive or other.

Should such developments take place, you may be sure that Cape Breton, which is the most important vantage point on the whole Atlantic coast, from the North Pole to the South, on account of its coal mines, would be greatly coveted by the United States, and it will be readily understood to what extent the holding of the Gulf and River St. Lawrence would be made difficult, were Cape Breton to fall into the hands of a foreign power.

Whoever contends that any government, whether American, French, English or other, will exact sacrifices of money and of men from their peoples, towards protecting, without compensation therefor, the interests, whatever they be, the trade, the welfare of a foreign country, is imposing on the good faith of his hearers or readers who take him seriously. No, Mr. Speaker, there never existed, and there does not exist today a country on the face of the earth that has not had to provide for its own defence, whether directly or through others, but always at its own expense.

I am not any more a spendthrift or a bravado than the most firmly convinced of the advocates of peace. I also, am opposed to militarism, and I trust that the idea of arbitration will prevail in the end. On the other hand, as long as international intercourse is carried on under the present system, I cannot agree that Canada should remain the only country in the world with coasts to protect, but without a single ship suitable for their defence.

The fair treatment which to this day is granted to those who are not in a position to defend themselves, is such an uncertain quantity, that not only a feeling of national pride, but one of self respect and the very instinct of self preservation should induce us to look for something better.

As we are aware that question was not at first a popular one in the province of Quebec. There are questions which it is advisable to take up first from the point of view of their drawbacks. Such is the proposal of undergoing a heavy expenditure for military purposes. Moreover our opponents took the lead. However, while such a policy has its drawbacks, its weak points, it has its strong points, its justification on the grounds of caution, dignity and the need of protection, and these will not be lost sight of any more in Quebec than in the other provinces of the Dominion. And when as the actual facts war-

Mr. BEAUPARLANT

rant us to do, we inform the people of Quebec that their opposition members in this House—averse as they are to contributing anything—greeted with tumultuous applause the proposal of the leader of the opposition to contribute at once the equivalent of two Dreadnoughts, or about \$25,000,000—a foregone conclusion—and when we add that the major part of that opposition who advocate an immediate contribution, applauded in the same way the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and his few followers, the electorate of Quebec and other parts of Canada who do not like double dealing, will say, as they have said since 1896, that they prefer the outspoken attitude taken by the government who for all sections of the country declare that we have reached the state of manhood, that consequently we are bound to act as men and to see to protecting ourselves, which is more satisfactory, and ultimately will be cheaper.

It has been contended that if the people were called upon to express an opinion, the answer would be against the proposed expenditure. If it were so, do you believe the leader of the opposition, after spending ten months in poisoning public opinion, would be willing to go even farther than he had decided to go in the footsteps of the government on March 24 last?

These hon. gentlemen are free to seek encouragement from audiences made up mainly of opponents of the government—which they have the right to be—and who have numerous other grievances against us. It is an easy matter to find flaws in a measure of such importance; but numerous queries remain unanswered after our opponents have stated their platform.

If through the courtesy of England and the United States we are to be dispensed with the burden of maintaining a navy, it is preferable to be a colony to being a sovereign state. In that case the inhabitant of the metropolis would be made to pay tribute to the colonist. That is certainly not in accordance with history, and the experience of all people the world over and from time immemorial upsets such a contention. There is no example of a nation having preferred the status of a colony to that of a sovereign state, as its ultimate condition. If a navy is an unnecessary thing, how is it that all countries of any standing in the world have provided themselves with one?

It is stated that there is no attack impending. As a matter of fact, there is no immediate danger, but Canada with its young and enterprising towns and its vast plains is the country which has the greatest attraction for immigrants from the old world; and if Japan has had the pluck to take exception to the management of schools in California with a view to protect-