ployments and callings. Quite a number of good positions surely will be secured for those students by the establishment of the new marine equipment. Our special school graduates will contribute in some way or other to the construction of the new fleet, and thereby contribute to the enhanced prosperity and greatness of Canada.

Ther are many other research for which I am and to vote for the passing of this Bill. 1 will vote for the Bill, because:

1. It will cost but a trifle per head of our population to build a few ships which will help England, satisfy our obligations towards her, and gratify our national pride; 2. The expenditure of a few cents per head.

2. The expenditure of a few cents per head, per year, may go to secure for Canada the concession from England of the power of making treaties, of the power to appoint Anglo-Canadian cot, uls, thereby securing for us benefits which will be at hundredfold greater to Canada than the total of r expenditure to-day;

3. I would rather stand by our parent state than depend upon American protection, I prefer British protection. 4. The building of a fleet will to a great

4. The building of a fleet will to a great extent help our classical and special school graduates;

5. It is in acordance with the dictum of the public *l* w of England towards Canada, for it is not within the province of the latter to refuse any contribution to help England;

6. The cr ion of a Canadian navy will to a large event tend to create for Canada new openings of trade, the establishment of new commercial agencies and negotiations of commercial treaties—three keys to the treacuries of the world;

7. This possession of a fleet is the best and only way to secure progress in peace for our country and to assure its everlasting prosperity.

For all these reasons, and many others, I appeal to this House, and to my constituents of St. James, not to begrudge a shilling a year for the maintenance of the prestige of England, and the chlargement of our national life.

And now, to those unthoughtful enough to close their eyes and stop their ears to the great lessons of history; to those who shoul aloud that nothing should be done to defend Canada, to those who are continuously, dangerously, creating agitation, to all those who do not wish to give an; kind of aid to England, whether they be r. oresentatives of the western grain growers, or agriculturists of Quebec, I would say this: You do not wart any naval defence for Canada, you prefer to remain in statu quo, you are afiaid of military and naval cxpenditure, let me remind you of a past which is still the present for us. If Canada, when she was a weak colony under

the French monarchy, had followed the advice, the adrionitions and prayers of that incomparable and immortal American statesman of the seventeenth century (though not born in America) Governor Frontenac, who implored France not to reconstruct the marvellous palace of Versailles, but to build a navy, to send soldiers to Nouvelle France, and to equip an army to protect its territory and the entrance of its Gulf of St. Lawrence, never would Wolfe have defeated Montcaim on the Plains of Abraham, and never would it have been possible for England to conquer Canada.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, should we have no navy, what Wolfe was able to do, one Von der Goltz or one Henri de Hohenzollhern, may try to repeat. Canada, being without may try to repeat. Canada, being without naval defence, without coast protection, should ever a European conflict hold back the English fleet in the North sea, the en-trance of the St. Lawrence would be left undefended against a hostile fleet which would be able to anchor before Montreal with much less risk than in the Baltic sea. Sir, such a possibility should awake in the people of Canada, and must especially in my fellow citizens of Quelec, a strong desire to grant what is asked from them to secure both a defence of our coasts, and a compliance with the wishes of England. My fellow citizens of Quebec, I am sure-and here. I believe, I am expressing their inner sentiments-are ready to stand by England to-day, for we are indebted to England for the fairness with which Eng-land has treated us. Should I speak tonight in my own mother language, it wou . be due to the liberality of England. The Latin and French languages were for hundreds of years the only languages spoken in the mother parmament on the banks of the Thames, in the same way that Greek and Latin had been the official languages of the parliament of Rome. I beg leave to convey to the English speaking eitizers of Canada tonight, the assurance that their French speaking friends will stand shoulder to shoulder with them for the maintenance of as did, British institutions in Cana twenty centuries ago, o ir ar Gaelic senators when they joi "s, the he Roman senators in the defence of state of Rome.

While I am saying all this, I cannot forbear from denouncing as infamous, the veiled charges of disloyalty which have been and are still being hurled against my compatriots. Sir, Quebec will always remember that beautiful sentiment enuneiated by the distinguished Prime Minister of Canada at a Paris banquet in 1905: 'To France, we owe our origin; to England, our liberty.'