

your navy. And if you go on training your men while those ships are being built you will have the men to man them. And if you think of building all the smaller sized vessels you will be able to have Canadian seamen to man the dreadnoughts built abroad. That is to say, you can begin building the smaller vessels in Canada at once, and by the time these are completed, you will perhaps have dreadnoughts on the stocks of a British navy yard. Or, take the other way, which does not seem to me so apt, build the dreadnoughts first, and then go on building the smaller vessels, under different conditions. Just now, to indulge in the vast expense of dreadnoughts in the present condition of public opinion in Great Britain, seems to be a little premature; but in that matter I would be guided by better advice than I have at the present time. If there is to be peace in Europe, we would not need those larger vessels, for England would have enough of her own to maintain her defence, but we might need the smaller vessels for coast defences, and these would be a small charge on the revenue. But these are matters of detail on which I do not absolutely bind myself.

Now for a few words in conclusion. I am somewhat distressed, I am bound to say, by the frequent references that are made in the other House to the partisan character of this Senate. I think they are in bad taste, and coming from the leader of the Government all the worse, because it is my contention that coming from his colleagues in that House, the charge is bad in proportion to the status of the colleague who makes the reference. If this is a partisan Senate it is a reflection upon hon gentlemen opposite just as much as it is upon those on this side of the House. We are not a divided Senate; we are one Senate. If the Senate is partisan on this side of the House, by concurring in measures approved by the Opposition and supported by us, what else is it, on the part of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who approve of, and support measures brought in by the Government—a government representing the party to which they belong. Any representations made as to partisanship on this side of the House, refers to one side of the House as much as the other.

Let us look at that question for a while. Mr. Borden made some remarks in the House the other day, some very strange remarks, as recorded on page 28 of the

'Hansard.' Speaking of the Senate in reference to the postponement of the Naval Bill he said:

The partisan conditions and misguided influence which occasioned the perverse and maladroitness of the Senate were not realized or understood either within the Empire or throughout the world.

Now could there be anything more caustic or more offensive than the terms there used?—'Partisan conditions,' 'misguided influence,' 'perverse and maladroitness.' This Senate ought to be abolished, forthwith, if it is perverse, if it is partisan, if its action is maladroitness. Then the hon. gentleman has a colleague, Hon. Mr. White, who was also of the opinion that we are very bad. He frequently refers to the partisan character of the Senate. I will quote from a speech of his delivered just at the closing hours of last session, when he was evidently very angry with the delay in the Naval Bill. Replying to Mr. Beland he says:

My hon. friend says he has the people; that I deny. Providence is on our side, I say, and there will come a time when a majority will not throw out a measure of this kind.

There is an appeal to Providence, and an appeal to the undertaker. It reminds me of the words of Mercutio, I think it was, who said:

Of comforts—

let us substitute the words 'Naval Bill'

—let no man speak. Let's talk of graves and worms and epitaphs.

Naval Bills are going to be carried after this by graves, and worms, and epitaphs. Mr. White says again, speaking of the Senate:

I feel that a measure designed for the benefit of the whole Empire has been thrown out and nullified for merely partisan considerations.

And he says again:

Any man whose hand can wield a hammer can break a statue, no matter how finely that statue may be wrought; and so, the partisan majority in the Senate can destroy a measure such as this, a measure of the utmost consequence and necessarily promoting the strength, unity and solidarity of the Empire. This is precisely what has been done—a body blow has been struck at the unity of the Empire.

And so, I need not go further for illustrations. That observation occurs at different places in his speech. Well, now, is this Senate partisan or is it not? If hon. gentlemen will refer to the position the Senate was intended to take in the constitution of Canada they will quickly understand that the Senate was not intended to be a mere