

referring to what we are doing at the present time until a permanent policy will be decided upon in 1921. I know my hon. friend reads the Toronto *Globe* and he must have seen the article.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not trying to draw a red herring across the trail. We are on the Naval Estimates and I am asking a concrete question: What is the Government naval policy? Has it a naval policy or has it not a naval policy? We on this side of the House understand that the Government has no naval policy. If it has, will the minister state it?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I stated on the floor of this House on March 25 and repeated a few days ago, and I reiterate now that no definite naval policy will be decided upon until after the Naval Conference that will be called in 1921. I also stated clearly on March 25, that we had accepted this cruiser and the torpedo boat destroyers, and that for the present we were going to carry on on pre-war lines. I have been consistent all the way through in my remarks on naval affairs.

Mr. DENIS: This is a rather technical question, and if I make any errors in the few remarks I intend to make, I trust the minister and the committee will be indulgent. As I see it, this new expenditure that we are asked to make is the outcome of the mission of Lord Jellicoe to this country. It is true that the report made by Lord Jellicoe is not being followed; in other words, no permanent policy is being at present adopted. But the underlying idea of that report is, in a nut-shell, that all of the Dominions should unite with the Mother Country in an effort to build the most powerful fleet in the world. And what we are doing now is only a step toward the fulfilment of that policy. Now, it has been said to-night by the minister that we have no permanent policy at present; and, if I mistake not, neither has Great Britain any permanent naval policy just now. The permanent policies of Great Britain and her colonies will be formulated in the course of the next Imperial Conference which is to be held in 1921. The view that we have no permanent policy is very clearly expressed in the memorandum which was read to the House some time ago and which will be found at page 3605 of *Unrevised Hansard*. I may quote the minister's statement:

In view of Canada's heavy financial commitments and of the fact that Great Britain has not as yet decided on her permanent naval

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

policy, and of the approaching Imperial Conference at which the question of naval defence of the Empire will come up for discussion between the Home Government and the Overseas Dominions, it has been decided to defer in the meantime action in regard to the adoption of a permanent naval policy for Canada.

The first point I want to bring to the attention of the minister is this. Since we have no permanent policy why should we take such a preliminary step as this, and why should we embark on any temporary policy? It seems to be generally admitted that we have no permanent policy, and we know also that the navy the Estimates for which we are asked to vote to-night would not be effective in case of war between now and 1921. Therefore what is the use of inaugurating a new policy which is not to be permanent and which, as a matter of fact, can be no policy at all until we are informed of the decisions on the naval question at the conference of 1921? From my point of view the money which we are going to spend now will be spent to no purpose. I said a moment ago that Great Britain contemplates having the largest and most powerful fleet in the world in conjunction with her Dominions. Now, there are two sides to that question. When war was declared by Germany practically the whole of the world united against her in order to destroy what was described as militarism. Germany had taken the necessary means to bring under her control what she considered to be the most powerful army in the world, and because Germany had created such a vast army the rest of mankind joined forces against her and decided on the destruction of militarism. Are we not to a certain extent in a similar position when we undertake to build the largest navy in the world? What was called militarism in Germany may, if we persist in this determination to create a huge and predominant fleet, give place to a state of things for which I can find no word in the dictionary but which I venture to term "navalism". We are undertaking a naval programme which will eventually bring the rest of the world into conflict with us. When I say "we", I mean Great Britain and her colonies. Let me state what the United States intend to do in this matter. They declared recently that they are going to build a navy even more powerful than any navy which Great Britain and her colonies united could ever build. To me, this naval rivalry is vying with German militarism in creating a feeling of international distrust. England has enjoyed the supremacy of the seas ever since the