

coast cities and fishing smacks, just as the U boats did. If my hon. friend has any anxiety on that score, let me assure him at once that I am a peaceful man and this is a peaceful Government. We have no idea whatever of sending these submarines out on such murderous cruises as the hon. member would lead the country to believe.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They will be peaceful submarines.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Let me tell my hon. friend again, before we leave the question of the cruiser, torpedo boat destroyers and submarines, that they are all modern. I hope the Parliament and Government of Canada will decide always to look after their own naval defence, and I trust that in the future, when a permanent policy is decided upon—as we fervently hope it will be at the conference of 1921—Canada may see her way clear, as her financial position will allow, to do something more in keeping with her dignity as a self-governing nation than what we are able to do at the present time owing to the strained financial condition of the country.

My hon. friend then came to the most startling part of his proposals. The hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Armstrong) asked him to whom we would turn, and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) said: We would turn to our neighbours, the Americans. And the hon. member would be satisfied that this country, that has shown its fervour and ability to take the part that she has nobly taken in the war, should take refuge under the Monroe doctrine if ever her shores were threatened in any way.

Mr. DUFF: Is it not true that the Government have to go every day with their hats in their hands to the United States for money, and that they will have to do that to get money for their new shipbuilding programme?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member will agree that that has nothing to do with the argument he has made or with the reply that I am now making to his remarkable speech. But let me tell him that I do not think he would have one member on his side of the House—and he certainly would not have one man on this side—who would for one moment agree with his suggestion that this country above all other countries in the British Empire would be satisfied to rest under the folds of the American flag and to depend upon the Monroe Doctrine if ever our shores were threatened. We all trust that our shores may never be

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

threatened; but if ever they be threatened, Canadians will defend the shores and ports of Canada in the future as they have always done in the past. If we have not sufficient naval forces to do that, we shall turn, not to our good friends the Americans or to the Monroe Doctrine, but to the Mother Country which has protected Canada from a naval standpoint ever since Canada has been a part of the British Empire. There has never been in the past, and there never will be in the future a time when Canada will find herself in such a humiliating position that she will have to take refuge under the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. DUFF: The minister says that we have never turned and we shall never turn to the United States for protection. He must have a bad memory. Does he not remember that in the summer of 1918, the coast of Nova Scotia, the Atlantic seaboard was protected not only by United States destroyers but by United States airships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am glad my hon. friend has asked me that question. Now that the war is over, I am at liberty to say that thousands and thousands of American troops went out by the St. Lawrence route and the ports of Halifax and Sydney, and American cruisers and American air forces were there for the protection of American ships and American soldiers.

Mr. DUFF: The minister did not answer my question.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend goes on to state that those torpedo boat destroyers, cruiser and submarines, although they are modern now, will, in his opinion, be obsolete five years from now. I prefer to take the opinion of Lord Jellicoe rather than that of the hon. member for Lunenburg. That distinguished naval officer states that neither a cruiser, a torpedo boat destroyer, nor a submarine, becomes obsolete under twelve or fifteen years. So we have at least twelve or fifteen years before any of the warships that England has been good enough to present to us, and which have been gratefully accepted by Canada, become obsolete.

I do not know where my hon. friend has been living when he has not been in Ottawa that he can say that public opinion in this country is against Canada expending the very meagre sum of \$2,000,000 on naval matters until such time as a permanent policy has been decided upon. He quoted from newspapers, but he took very good care not to quote that well-known Liberal paper the