

the world as a result of the war. Let us who believe in the League of Nations gather strength from what has been done at Washington. Let us keep our faith strong, and let our faith grow stronger, in the ultimate destiny of the great English-speaking peoples of the Empire to which we belong and the Republic which is our neighbour to the south, with their common ideals and common institutions; not as forces to overpower and to overawe, but as civilizing, guiding, strengthening forces, directive in the very best sense of the word as pointing the way in which the nations of the world should walk.

Hon. Mr. ROCHE: Honourable gentlemen, I wish to add my feeble tribute of gratification that the negotiations at Washington will result in the benefits to the world which have been depicted so eloquently by my right honourable friend the junior member for Ottawa (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster) and also in the essay with which the honourable leader of the Government introduced the approval of the resolution.

I wish that I were as optimistic and sanguine as my right honourable friend opposite, that the negotiations at Washington will result in such widespread harmony and brotherly love as he desires. I desire as ardently as he, or as any friend of peace desires, that those negotiations and the feelings engendered by them and by the meetings may result in the attainment and the maintenance of world peace. But this we must keep in mind, that the press is used by some power or influence to pervert the tendencies of the events and actions which are going on in Europe. Whether it be for the furtherance of the purposes of any one nation, or whether it be designed to influence the stock exchange, or what the object is, I do not know; but the press seems to be controlled and managed by some unseen power for the furtherance of oblique designs.

My right honourable friend opposite, with his usual eloquence, has declared that the reduction of naval armaments is a great factor in securing the peace of the world; that it is a great evidence of the good will and mutual respect which the nations bear towards one another. Let us examine that proposition. Each one of those nations profoundly distrusts the other. Each of the fifty-one nations that signed the Treaty and joined in the League of Nations distrusts the other fifty, believing that they are merely deceitful and

have sinister designs. The United States are to have a quota of 525,000 tons of capital ships; England also is to have 525,000 tons of capital ships; Japan 325,000 tons of capital ships; Italy 175,000; and so on. Each nation has reserved the very power which it could exercise to the utmost advantage to dominate other powers. All peace makers.

I have seen, and probably other honourable gentlemen have seen, the *Renown*, the latest production of the British Navy. She is a capital ship. A vessel of that description would have about 25,000 tons displacement; I think the calculation is on the displacement. The allowance of 525,000 tons would permit of 21 capital ships like the *Renown* being built and maintained by Great Britain or the United States. The cost of each one of those ships would be \$30,000,000. There we have, for the mere building of ships, an expenditure of \$650,000,000. Each of these ships is the equivalent of three ships, one inside another. They are built to resist torpedoes, shot, and submarine attack.

What was the action of the French Government? It reserved the right to build submarines. Other nations reserved a similar right to build submarines—Why? Because they know that the submarine is the only marine creation that can resist the capital ship, and is a match for it. That is the reason why they retain the right to build and operate submarines. They excluded the use of noxious gas and dealt with other matters of no great consequence or effect in war. During the Great War the Allied fleet had 47 of the best ironclads. They were protected by torpedo chains and torpedo destroyers and various other means of defence, but they dare not venture out to sea on account of the submarines. Seven of them were lost in the Battle of Jutland. We heard nothing about it at the time. It is known by every expert—and I do not pretend to be an expert—that a great many ships of the British Navy have to be scrapped because they have not the inside protection necessary to defend themselves against submarines.

So there is not so much security for peace when the most formidable engines of war have not been eliminated and when, under the allowance of tonnage, Great Britain and the United States can each build 21 of the most powerful modern ironclads and put them on the Atlantic or the Pacific as they choose.

And what is the attitude of France, another great Power? France has carefully