

governed both political parties of Great Britain with respect to foreign relations.

That is a splendid sentence.

How the present administration will work it 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 materials, by 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.

Then he went on to flatter the aspirations of his constituents.

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.

Then this friendly newspaper says:

To-day should be Nova Scotia's opportunity.

Carried away by the enthusiasm of my hon. friend, and by the prospect of a navy of which Halifax is to be the centre. Then this enthusiastic paper says that my hon. friend went on to tell them:

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

My hon. friend now does not propose to let Nova Scotia have an opportunity, he proposes to remove any chance whatever of Nova Scotia building ships.

Providence has endowed this province with the material—

My hon. friends opposite, who do not think that we can build ships in Canada, see what your leader tells you:

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.

Splendid words, were they not? I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is not the bounden duty of the leader of the opposition to go back to his constituents and tell them that he has turned his back on the whole thing, that Nova Scotia's opportunity has passed away, that he will not do anything to retain it, that they shall never build ships in Nova Scotia, if he can prevent them from doing it. My hon. friend kept the faith until January 12 of this year, when he said:

Canada could not be a hermit nation. Canadian interests will exist and must be protected not only upon the high seas, but in every quarter of the globe. The great empire of China attempted to isolate herself from the rest of the world and did so with some measure of success, but the result was not encouraging. To conceive that Canada could play any such part in these days of steam and electricity, when the oceans of the world have ceased to be an impassable barrier and

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD.

have become magnificent highways, is but an idle dream.

Then my hon. friend does not want any permanent co-operation. If Canada can only be defended by the use of her own material, then my hon. friend's policy is not a policy of permanent co-operation. He goes on to say:

By the use of our own material, the employment of our own people, the development and utilization of our own skill and resourcefulness, and above all by impressing upon the people a sense of responsibility for their share in international affairs. I regard the resolution of March last as the most important step towards co-operation that has been made in this country for 25 years.

That is the view of my hon. friend in January, and he stuck to that view in a half-hearted way down to February 3, when he began to try to escape from his position, when the thumb screw, and the rack, and the composing room the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) told us about, got in their fell work; and the people of Canada were treated to the humiliating spectacle of a leader of a great party absolutely going back on every principle he had laid before them inside of a year. But even then he hung on, to some extent, to the old faith when he said on February 3:

As far as I am concerned, while the system of annual contributions might be best, and, no doubt, would be best from the purely strategical standpoint, I firmly believe that no such system could be adopted, but that eventually and permanently the basis upon which Canada must contribute to the defence of the empire will be by employing our own material, our own men, our own resources and the skill of our own people.

Well, now, when we have been able to call a witness like my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and get such strong testimony from him, you would think it was scarcely necessary to go on and amplify our case. If we were trying this matter before a jury the testimony of the leader of the opposition would be sufficient in the minds of any reasonable men to convince them that the proper thing for this country to do was to start out with the construction of a Canadian navy, the employment of our own men and material, to build the ships in Canadian shipyards, and thereby we would be giving the best assistance to the empire. Don't you think that would be right? Well, I have ample testimony here upon the subject. It is not often that counsel in arguing a case is able to go to the ranks of the opposing counsel and to their witnesses and to prove every step of his case out of the mouths of the men who are opposing him. Yet that is the position in which the government finds itself