

destruction of the Spanish and the French fleets, and certainly no one regrets this fact. Up to the present time every country of the world has greatly benefited by the naval power which Great Britain has exercised. But will this be the fact for all time? Speaking in Ottawa in November or December last, Lord Jellicoe said:

The Empire must maintain a balance of sea-power which will enable her to meet and conquer any enemy.

About the same time he said in Toronto:

We ought to maintain forces that are sufficient to deal with any possible enemy.

This means, obviously, that we ought to maintain a fleet that can meet the rest of the world. For the last century England's supremacy has been unchallenged, but I do not know that her path, so far as control of the seas is concerned, will be in the future as smooth as it has been in the past. Let us see what the United States are saying. About ten days after Lord Jellicoe made the declarations I have just quoted, a despatch from Washington on December 9 last announced to the world that the Official Bureau of Naval Construction of the United States was recommending a programme the execution of which in five years would make the American fleet the equal of the most powerful fleet maintained by any nation of the world.

This statement was issued on December 9. Let us see what has been done by the United States since that time. I hold in my hand a very valuable, and I may say an accurate, review which is published in the United States, the Literary Digest. In its issue of June 19, 1920, there appears the following:

Our Navy to Lead the World: Just why America should be feverishly building huge battleships and battle cruisers at a rate that will soon make us the strongest naval power on earth is a question that is interesting Great Britain, Japan, and some people in our own land. The launching of the "Tennessee" the world's largest battleship, has renewed the talk about this matter. Twelve dreadnoughts and six great battle cruisers, with electrically driven engines, and mounting in all 152 sixteen inch rifles and 24 fourteen inch rifles soon are to be constructed. The cruisers will be 374 feet long and will have a speed of 37 miles per hour. The displacement of the "Iowa" and the "Massachusetts", two of the new battleships, will be 43,000 tons as against the "Tennessee's" 32,000 tons, and they will be two knots faster than this ship.

In other words, the new Massachusetts will be about four times as large as the Massachusetts of Spanish-War fame. To round out the Navy's stupendous programme, a proportionate number of scout-cruisers, destroyers, and submarines are being built.

From this one can very well understand—it is no secret by any means—that the

United States are contemplating now the creation of the largest and most powerful navy in the world. And if England has the absolute right to make claim to the largest and most powerful navy in the world it is a right which equally belongs to the United States. Let us see what is going to happen as a result of this situation. On the one hand we have England Mistress of the Seas for over a century, and she wants to keep this supremacy, and rightly too. I would be very glad to see England keep it. On the other hand we have the United States, which has a population two and a half times that of England, and which is richer than England, saying: We are going to build the largest and most powerful navy in the world. We have that sort of a conflict in actual existence between the two most powerful nations in the world. What will be the outcome of it? In order that England may have the largest and most powerful fleet we are asked—not through this vote because this is only the beginning—to contribute to England's navy. The minister said a minute ago that he was relying on the law which was passed in 1910 as a reason why this vote should be accepted. Of course the law which was passed in 1910 provided for a much larger expenditure on the naval programme than that which is now under discussion. But in 1910 conditions were different,—I will come to that point later on. For the time being we have two of the most powerful nations in the world facing one another and each saying: I am going to build the largest navy in the world. In other words: I am challenging you. There is a challenge in that. Why are these navies being built? They are not being built for commerce or trade; they are being built in order that one of these nations shall acquire supremacy of the seas. The United States are building the largest navy because they want to contest the hegemony which England has had for a hundred years on the seas. On the other hand England wants to keep her supremacy. Are we in a position to intervene between the two? Notwithstanding the fact that we are part of the British Empire, and notwithstanding that we are in sympathy with England's cause, are we in a position to intervene? I say we are not, on account of our geographical situation. If Canada was far distant from the United States we might very well have a naval programme and go into the building of war ships. But now we cannot go into that programme because we cannot at any time unite our navy with the English navy in order to counteract the American navy.