

and guides us in the ways which we have adopted. It seems to me that the policy adopted by the country is wide enough; that we have enough to do within the limits of our attributions, without attempting to put on important airs which ill-becomes us, because we have neither the numbers nor the money, nor the necessary resources. All this will come later on; our population will increase and so will our resources, and if our descendants do not find that their position is the proper one, they will complain to the Mother Country. She will not raise any difficulty as to terms; she has already shown that on several occasions, and if in those days our descendants find that they are too grown up to be guided by England and to be protected by her, they will see what it is best for them to do; but in our day, I do not see that we have anything to gain in that direction; we have, on the contrary, everything to lose. We shall lose England's protection; we shall lose the resources afforded us by its revenues; we shall lose its fleet; we shall lose its army; we shall lose its flag, which in itself is a safeguard of our liberties. England does not meddle with our affairs in Canada; we are as free as a foreign power; we are simply told that we cannot negotiate our own treaties of commerce. Yet we have to-day in London our commercial agent, Sir A. T. Galt, and when we asked that he should be allowed to be present at the negotiations with France and with Spain, so that he might give advice in so far as our affairs were concerned, was this request refused? No; England assented. Now, what does that cost us? We have incurred no responsibility and such a position has not cost us anything. We reap all its advantages without having to bear its burdens. It is to be regretted, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Laval should have seen fit to separate himself from us on this question. I know that he is right when he says that the idea is not a new one with him, still I had hoped that he would have seen that the time has not come to develop it; that, on the contrary, that it is more opportune for us to remain *in statu quo*. We are growing in the shade of the British flag, let us continue to do so. Have we not made considerable progress during the past ten or fifteen years? We have been granted Confederation and the charter of our liberties, and it is a Confederation and a charter which many other nations would gladly enjoy. We have at times heard other nations tell us that they would be glad to possess our charter of liberties. We should not therefore change that position, for it is one worthy of ovation of 10,000,000 and even 20,000,000 of a population. We are not in the position of India which is simply governed by a Council, which I might call a Special Council and a Governor. Here it is the people who govern themselves through representatives freely elected by them; we have no other Council than that of the nation. We have our representatives of the various Provinces, not only chosen by the representatives of the Sovereign, but the organs of the great majority of the national representation in this House. It is consequently the people who govern the country, and what more can we desire? We wish to change our position simply to be able to say, that instead of obtaining a commercial treaty with France through a British ambassador in France, that we are going to obtain it direct through a Canadian commercial agent. I do not think that this position will be accepted by the House or by the country. On the contrary, I think that the position which we have accepted is the rational one, and that which the people desire to see maintained; the people wish for a long time to come to remain in the shade of the British flag, under the ægis of the British fleet. We and our children will grow up under such a condition, our country will become peopled, important and happy, and happier than it is to-day, for we are as happy as any nation of the globe, but a powerful country, a numerous people capable of deciding what we have to do. (The hon. gentle-

man continued in English): I regret that my hon. friend from Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) has taken the course he has adopted. The hon. gentleman does not believe that this is a vote of want of confidence against the Government, because if he thought so he would not cast his vote in that way, for he would not separate himself from his political friends. He says that the reason why he does not consider this a vote of non-confidence is because he has seen during this Session two motions proposed in amendment on the motion to go into Supply, and the Government did not take them as votes of non-confidence. The hon. gentleman forgot that those two motions were moved by friends of the Government and were accepted by the Government, and that they having been so moved and so accepted, could not be considered as votes of non-confidence. But this a different motion. It is a motion made by the leader of the Opposition, and he proposes therein a policy entirely contrary to the policy of the Government, and therefore we have to select between the policy of the leader of the Opposition and the policy of the leader of the Government. That is the position which the hon. member for West Durham has taken and that is the position he wants us to take. Well, we have no hesitation about it. We saw the hon. member for West Durham alongside of the junior member for Victoria. He was, no doubt, encouraging the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DECOSMOS. I rise to a point of order. I ask that the words of the hon. gentleman be taken down. I ask the hon. member for West Durham if I said a single word to him about this question or he to me.

Mr. BLAKE. Not a word passed between the hon member and myself in respect to this matter in the slightest degree.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The interruption is out of order. The hon. member had no right to interrupt me because I was stating this. I was saying that the hon. member for West Durham was alongside of the junior member for Victoria, and I said I had no doubt he was there encouraging the hon. gentleman. But the junior member for Victoria did not give me time to finish my sentence. He says: "I want those words taken down." "That he was encouraging the hon. gentleman." If that is not a parliamentary expression, I would say he was discouraging the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for West Durham was encouraging the hon. gentleman by his presence alongside of him, and the junior member for Victoria rose and assented to the proposal of the hon. member for West Durham. He said he was in favor of the motion and that he would vote for it, because he found that the principles advocated by the hon. member for West Durham would lead as a necessary consequence to the independence of the country. It is that point I want to bring out. The hon. gentleman is quite logical; he must not think I want to speak against his reasoning—these are his own ideas; but I want to have them out to show that the necessary consequence of the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, the leader of the Opposition, is the independence of the country. It is as well we should know it in this House; it is as well the electors of the country should know it. The House has to select between the principles of the leader of the Opposition and those of the Government as advocated by the First Minister. The leading principle of hon. gentlemen opposite is the independence of the country; we on this side wish to remain as we are, connected with Great Britain. When I so speak I speak as the representative of my Province, on behalf of the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec and of French Canadians all through the Dominion. We do not want a change, we are quite satisfied as we are. Our religion and language are different from those of the Mother Country, but that does not matter—that is not the question with