

timent of the great majority of the people of Canada.

The hon. gentleman (Hon. R. L. Borden) intimates that we will have a plebiscite. But think of handing over a great matter of policy such as this to a plebiscite which may mean nothing, and which certainly will not bring out one-half, even if it brings out one-quarter of the vote of Canada. My hon. friend knows that the scheme is unworkable. He knows he will not satisfy the people of this country in this way. He knows that he will place Canada in a position of humiliation in which she never need be placed. It is a scheme which, I believe he will regard, on full consideration, as ill advised, and, therefore, not to be carried out.

For my part, I am a firm believer in the policy adopted by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the opposition, and by the Liberal party, the policy of building our own navy. I believe we have reached the time in our history when it is our duty to adopt whatever means may be necessary to protect ourselves and to render to the mother country in time of danger whatever assistance it may be possible for us to render. We know that it is possible to do something in the way of training soldiers on short notice, for we have had experience of that in the past. But we know also that such a course is impossible in the case of naval defence. We know that naval defence involves the employment of trained, technical officers and seamen. A horde of untrained men on board a man-of-war would be worse than useless. Therefore, if we are going to do anything, we must commence somewhere, and I do not think we can commence a day too soon.

There is another side to the question—the moral effect which the building of a navy by ourselves will have upon the rest of the world. This is worth more to us than all the millions of dollars we should contribute even if we were to adopt the policy of contributing \$25,000,000 now and \$25,000,000 two or three years hence. The sending out of a few thousand men to South Africa to take part in the war there brought about results that will outlast the life of any man in this building. By that course we placed Canada in a position which no money contribution could have secured for us. We not only increased our national spirit, but we compelled the admiration of the people of the empire generally. Even considering it on the low basis of money value alone, we have got back in the last ten years a hundredfold what it cost us.

By pursuing that course with respect to the navy, we will place ourselves in a much better position than we occupy at the present time. In my opinion, the amendment of the leader of the opposition is well

advised, and I hope the leader of the government and his friends will take this matter to heart, and will accept the amendment, and that we may then go on our way in the development of the policy inaugurated by the late government, taking the manly course of making a start, building a navy, so that if the need ever arises, we may be in a position to do our share in the defence of Canada and the defence of the empire.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, it was to me a matter of great surprise to hear the right hon. gentleman the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) speaking on the motion made by the leader of the government for the appointment of a Speaker. Clouds and darkness were around about him sufficient to obscure what I had expected to see, namely, the sunny ways of conciliation. Instead of adopting the policy of conciliation, the right hon. gentleman, and those supporting him seem to have adopted a very different policy, a policy of sowing seeds of discord, a policy of perpetuating strife, a policy of preventing the cementing of the bonds of unity and friendship between all classes of our population, without which no nation can ever attain peace or permanence or prosperity. It was also a matter of surprise to me that the right hon. gentleman should have referred in the way he did to the prairie provinces, expressing sorrow for the way in which they had been treated by the electorate recently and sympathy with them in their present misery. No doubt he included the province of Manitoba in his reference to the prairie provinces. Now the province of Manitoba was brought into the confederation in the year 1870 by a Conservative government, the people of that province well understand the principles of the Conservative party, and the principles of the Liberal party; and, because they well understand the distinction between the two parties, they saw fit to send a very large majority of members to support the present government. When the right hon. gentleman offers his sympathy to the people of Manitoba, I trust he will not forget the way in which that province was unjustly treated by the late government, refused fair consideration in respect to her boundaries, denied her prayer to be placed on an equality with the other provinces which are the creation of the right hon. gentleman and his administration. So when he sympathizes with Manitoba and expresses his sorrow for their present condition, I scarcely think the people of that province will consider him sincere, or even thank him for his sympathy. The people of that province expressed their resentment for the way