

suggested in the Main Estimates and, second, on what is suggested in the Supplementary Estimates. The hon. gentleman the other evening asked the committee to consider the two items together. I think Hansard will show that the expression used was "to consider them together." Certainly, I gave my consent on this side on the understanding that it was the consideration and not the voting of the items together that was proposed. I think the chances are that the Speaker of the House will rule that we have no power to vote on the two items as though they were one item. The minister, I am sure, will make more progress with his Estimates if he allows them to be voted on in the order in which they were presented to Parliament than if he tries to prevent that on a mere technicality.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: According to the Rules of the House the Main and Supplementary Estimates could not be considered or voted on together without the unanimous consent of the committee. The leader of the Opposition will remember that on Saturday night last the Chairman asked for the unanimous consent of the committee to consider both of these and there was no objection to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To consider both, but not to vote on both. I am absolutely agreeable that we should consider both so that we will only have one discussion and be done with it, but I think we should vote on the Main Estimates first and then on the Supplementary Estimates. If my hon. friend is unwilling to agree to that we will have to use whatever means are necessary to ensure the proper consideration of these items.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I understood that the general discussion on the naval policy had not been concluded. I do not know how far I am right in that, as I was not here; but I should like for a very few minutes to make some observations in connection with the vote. I want to be as brief as possible, but if I did not say something at this time I should be untrue to certain convictions to which I cannot be untrue without being untrue to myself. I concede to the minister and to the Government that in introducing this very considerable—this very large—vote they were confronted with a difficulty. We had extended naval discussions a few years ago and at that time a number of us occupying seats on this side of the House were strongly committed to the principle of a Canadian

navy. I concede that the Government had to take that into their consideration and they had to further consider the fact that we in Canada had wholeheartedly fought alongside the Old Land and other portions of the Empire through the Great War. But, having conceded that, I must say that there are other very weighty considerations which occur to my mind and which would lead me to express the opinion that the Government had been shortsighted in accepting the offer of the British Government at this particular time. Having regard to the financial position of the country on the one hand and to the fact that there is to be an Imperial Conference, as I understand, in 1921, to discuss the whole question of the naval defence of the Empire, I think they were shortsighted to have accepted the offer. I think they might very well have based themselves where I base myself in criticism of their policy—they might very well have said to Lord Jellicoe, and the Admiralty, and the British Government: Well, we are meeting to discuss this matter with the representatives of the whole Empire at an Imperial Conference in 1921, and we refuse at this time to commit the country to what is a very large naval expenditure which, in the very nature of things, will lead to much larger naval expenditures, if history has anything to teach us upon this subject. I base myself there first in criticism of the Government in having embarked upon this policy. They would have saved money in the meantime; they would have saved a very divided state of opinion in the country; they would have saved—if rumour informs us rightly—considerable divisions in the ranks of their own party, which appear in caucus if they do not appear in Parliament; they would have saved this political discussion at a moment when we all want to get away to our homes after a somewhat arduous session. There are other considerations that I think ought to have weighed with the Government in approaching this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the remark made by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), when he said that the whole question of naval defence, the whole question of the naval defences of the Empire, the whole question of armaments, has been vastly changed by the lessons of the war and by the conditions of the peace; and the first consideration I should like to advance in that connection is this: I should like to quote an old hackneyed saying, "that arm-