

ed half a continent of sparse, feeble provinces into a strong nation. What mysterious disability prevents us building warship. Extravagance, is it argued? Graft? Nonsense. There will be no more of either than there has been about the rest of our nation-building, which on the whole has been a mighty good job.

This is from the Ottawa Journal, a respectable Conservative newspaper. I commend to hon. gentlemen opposite the reasons given there why a navy should be built and why a policy of contribution should not be embarked upon. But perhaps the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) would like to have some authority that he cannot dispute. I am going to quote now from the Halifax Herald, the organ that he swears by, the paper which he takes his inspiration from, and I am sure that he will admit that everything in the Halifax Herald is gospel truth. On September 29, 1909, that paper said:

The little Candians would have us think that British dissatisfaction is with our sturdy insistence on our autonomy.

This simply is not true.

British comment especially among Unionist and Imperial newspapers, which really pay attention to the affairs of the Empire, absolutely recognizes not only our right to handle our own defence problems but also the advisability of our so doing. The dissatisfaction is not with our disposition to manage our own naval force. It is over our slackness in getting a naval force worth managing.

We have two problems because we have two oceans.

(1) The Atlantic ocean is our road to our principal market. Upon it lives our principal, and for all serious purposes, our only maritime population. At the far end of the Atlantic voyage is Britain with her navy, at the near end is Canada, sending out from her seaports a trade for which she has established no local protection. The situation seems to be:

(a) The grand issue will be decided by battleships and in European waters. Great Britain is supreme in these waters now and will bear the burden of Imperial defence in them for some time yet.

(b) But an attack on our Atlantic commerce might be made while the battleships' struggle was going on. To meet this, we have a local naval defence. As our strength grows, our ships must guard more of the Atlantic routes.

Referring to the Pacific coast, the same editorial goes on:

Thus our duty on the Pacific seems to be:

(a) To guard our coastline so that we shall be able to warn off it all warships of other powers. For this, our principal need is torpedo craft.

(b) To work with Australia, New Zealand and the Imperial authorities in getting up some sort of Pacific ocean force.

Canada's honour is pledged to the carrying out of an arrangement with Australia

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish)

for patrolling the waters of the Pacific and to-day we find that the Australian Government is complaining that Canada has broken faith—a nice position for Canada to be put in. But if my hon. friend still doubts the fact that naval defence was the policy of the Conservative party in 1908 and down to 1911, let me quote from a campaign sheet which the Conservative party circulated in Halifax during the election. It is the campaign sheet to which the right hon. Prime Minister owes his election in that constituency. It is headed:

Mr. R. L. Borden's splendid steel ship-building policy for Halifax.

No suggestion of a contribution, no suggestion that the people are not able to build warships, that it was a useless waste of money to attempt to do so, or that it would be folly on our part to engage in any venture of the kind. This campaign sheet says:

Addressing a public gathering in Halifax, on the evening of the 14th October, 1909, the Liberal-Conservative leader, Mr. R. L. Borden, made an important declaration on the subject of steel ship-building at this port, which must have given much satisfaction to our people who, for many years previously, had been seeking aid for such an industry from the Laurier Government, but who had been receiving only very cold, and empty and, as the event proved, very worthless promises from the ministers.

On that occasion the Liberal-Conservative leader said:

The House of Commons last session laid down a certain policy touching naval defence in which both political parties united. It may have not satisfied the aspirations of all Conservatives, but it seemed our bounden duty to place, if possible, above the limits of partisan strife a question so vital and far-reaching, and to attain the standard which has for many years governed both political parties in Great Britain with respect to foreign relations.

How the present Administration will work out the policy which was outlined by the resolution to which I have alluded, remains to be seen. One governing principle, at least, should control, namely, that out of our own labour and by the instructed skill of our own people, any necessary provision for our naval defence should be made so far as may be reasonably possible. In this connection, may we not hope that there shall be given a stimulus and encouragement to the ship-building industry of Canada which has long been lacking?

To-day should be Nova Scotia's opportunity in that regard.

Providence has endowed this province with the material, with the men and with the maritime situation which are essential not only for developing a scheme of naval defence and protection, but also for the resuscitation of that ship-building industry which once made Nova Scotia famous throughout the world.

That was an important and highly satisfactory declaration, from the leader of the Oppo-