

Government of the day would have had imposed upon Canada a law under which the Government of the Dominion could go to any one province at any time and say: I have \$1,000,000 to expend in your province for highways. If you do not wish to accept that sum for your roads we will build the roads ourselves in view of the next election. And so that province would have been placed in the position of either refusing the amount of money or allowing its provincial rights to be subverted so that provincial rights would have been non-existent in the country in a few years. Of course, we had the promise of the right hon. the Prime Minister that everything should be done on the basis of equity. But, especially since the spectacle we had here last Wednesday, we cannot—I do not say personally—but politically—feel the same admiration for him that we formerly felt, nor in such a matter can we take his word. As I have said, had it not been for the Senate, provincial rights would have ceased already. And if the Senate does its duty this session the result will be equally beneficial. I know very little of the senators, and have no means of judging what they will do. I know very well what I would do if I were in the Senate. My right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if he were in his seat, would do me the justice to say that I willingly gave my claim to a man of my own race in the province of Nova Scotia, who has since been called to a higher and happier chamber. I have every confidence in the members of the Senate, not as Liberals but as representatives of Canadian public opinion and as public men of high position and I hope they will, when the occasion rises, do their duty as members of the great body given to the people of Canada by the constitution for the protection of minorities and of provincial rights. I say I have every confidence in the Senate. You have heard me, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the motion for the abolition of the Senate moved by the hon. member for Lincoln—who has not brought in that motion since the change of Government—declare that I believed the people of the Maritime provinces especially would not consent to the abolition of the Senate, and also gave my own opinion which I have just repeated here that the Senate was placed by the founders of Confederation aside from the turmoil of politics to act as watchful guardians over the rights of minorities. It was known at Confederation that the Senate might not have to act in defence of the principles specially put in its charge more than once in twenty-five years, but it was felt that if the Senate rose to the right true limit of its duty when the interests of which it was the guardian were attacked, it would well repay the people of Canada for all the ex-

Mr. TURGEON.

pense involved in maintaining that body.

I may be asked: What are we to do? I do not wish to see disturbances in this House or in the country; but I say, it is worth while, in the interests of the country, that the Opposition may be able to set forth intelligently as well as forcibly reasons why such a Bill as the Navy Bill should not pass without the consent of the people. If I were asked what I would suggest, I would say to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government: Withdraw your Closure Bill; then, withdraw your Naval Act; and then go on with the business of the country. To hon. gentlemen opposite I would say: Put into effect the naval law of 1910, which was based upon the unanimous resolution of this House in 1909; do this, and we will give you every cent of the money you want. Call for tenders, and have the ships built in Canada by Canadian workmen and with Canadian material, thus building up a Canadian navy for the protection of the trade routes of Canada, ever ready to go to the defence of the Empire at such time as the Government may deem necessary or advisable; then the business of the country will go on.

We have received suggestions of conciliation from other quarters. Yesterday or the day before, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy said in London that he hoped that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the right hon. leader of the Government would come to some harmonious understanding as a result of which some unanimous conclusion in regard to the matter would be reached. But on March 29, 1909, the loyal and the unanimous sentiments of the House were expressed by the resolution brought forward by the greatest parliamentarian on the other side, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and, if hon. gentlemen opposite have gone back on that resolution, it is not our fault. Harmony would once again be established if hon. gentlemen opposite would, to-night or to-morrow, decide to withdraw—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. TURGEON: Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh, but some time they will laugh on the other side. Public opinion in this country will always find a means to be heard, with respect, and, before another four or six weeks have passed, perhaps hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will realize that their position is neither patriotic nor Imperialistic, and that the advice given at the present time by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House should have prevailed.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that closure has been adopted in the Parliament of Great Britain. Great Britain, with her