

to membership in a party whose political ancestors burned the Parliament buildings and stoned the Governor General through the streets of Montreal? I would ask him further how he can purge himself from the taint of disloyalty that, according to his standards, attaches to members of a party whose chief mouthpiece so much the worse for British connection? were injured by the national policy, then so much the worse for British connection. I would ask him further how he can purge himself from the taint of disloyalty that attaches, according to his standards, to membership in a party whose leader, the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, when the British authorities appealed to him for troops for the Soudan took the position that they could come and raise troops in this country if they wished, but so far as he and his Government were concerned, not a man, not a dollar? I would ask him how he can justify the position which he took with reference to some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when he and the members of his party opposed, not once but several times the British preference introduced by the Liberal party of Canada? When my hon. friend answers these questions and answers them to the satisfaction of the people of this country, then he may be in a position to read us on this side of the House a lecture on loyalty.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Inland Revenue said that if Sir John A. Macdonald had been alive, troops would never have gone to South Africa.

Mr. MURPHY: Not only my hon. friend but practically all the speakers on the other side of the House have taken the position that we cannot build ships in Canada, and that the three empty ships which the Government proposes to present to Great Britain can be built more quickly and more cheaply in England. As to the first part of that statement, it has been refuted so often that I do not intend to add anything further to what has been said. I merely wish to say that it constitutes a gross slander on Canadian intelligence, Canadian industry and Canadian skill; and that the men who made that assertion will find that it will recoil upon their own heads. As to the other contention that ships can be built more quickly and more cheaply in Great Britain than in Canada, I am not, in the face of information that has come to hand, prepared to admit that, either as a general principle or as applied to the circumstances of this particular case. Let me show you why I cannot accept that statement. In Truth, the London newspaper, there appeared this statement on December 4, 1912:

130½

It looks as if a little crop of presentation ships will have to be built. But where? The shipyards of the country are taxed to their full capacity.

Later on, there appeared in the Daily Telegraph of January 6, 1913, an article dealing with the question of ship-building, from which I will read a few extracts. The Daily Telegraph said:

Under normal conditions shipbuilding is more rapid in this country than abroad. But, owing to the pressure of work of all kinds which now exists, considerable delays are being experienced in all the great private shipbuilding yards of the United Kingdom. This retaliation will continue even if no labour troubles supervene—as is not improbable—further to retard construction. Consequently no reliance can be placed on the reputed celerity of British construction.

The same issue, discussing the navy estimates, said:

The navy estimates will reach an aggregate of nearly £50,000,000. This increase of between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000 is due to many causes.

A sum of about £2,000,000 which was not spent last year—1911-12—has to be revoted; the votes for officers and men, in consequence of the increase in numbers and the new scale of pay, will absorb an additional sum of between half and three-quarters of a million sterling.

But the serious item is traceable to the upward movement in the cost of shipbuilding. All the contracts that have been lately placed, and that will have to be placed in the near future, reflect this movement.

The article proceeds:

It is calculated that the cost of constructing an ordinary merchant vessel has advanced by over 30 per cent. in the past two years, and in the case of men-of-war the difference is proving not less remarkable.

Everything required by the Admiralty—guns, torpedos, armour, ships' plates—all show advances. The period of cheap shipbuilding, from which the country has gained an immense advantage, has come to an end.

With all the allied industries concerned in shipbuilding working at the highest pressure—for we still build for a large part of the world—the Admiralty will have some difficulty in getting its contracts placed under a reasonable time-limit, and in every case the prices quoted show a great expansion, which is reacting seriously on the navy votes.

In view of these statements from authoritative British sources, I submit that the Government is deprived of their chief argument for having these ships built in England. If the Government were inclined to listen to the voice of reason, they would pay heed to what their supporter the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) said in this House on the subject on March 29, 1909. Speaking on that occasion, the hon. gentleman declared:

Shipbuilding is a splendid enterprise, an enterprise that gives employment to a great