

were placed in an absurdly high position, and there I agree with my hon. friend. At one time we did think quite anxiously of reducing our percentage. I think at the time we had so much discussion about it—I speak subject to correction, because I have not the figures before me, and I have not looked them up—the vote was about \$186,000. It is very little smaller now. There has been no radical change at all. I would like to find out on what basis we are now paying, and whether the original basis which we all thought was not fair at the time has been departed from.

Mr. HOEY: What was the basis?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Our contribution was based on the postal union arrangement, which had absolutely nothing to do with the possibilities of taxation and that sort of thing in Canada as compared with other countries.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There has been a considerable improvement along that line. The contribution for 1925 is \$4,696 less than in 1924, and \$32,000 less than in 1922.

Canada pays 35 units out of a total of 935; the larger contributors are as follows:

	Units
Great Britain.. . . .	88
France.. . . .	78
Italy.. . . .	61
Japan.. . . .	61
India.. . . .	60
China.. . . .	50
Spain.. . . .	40
Canada.. . . .	35
Argentina.. . . .	35
Brazil.. . . .	33
Czecho-Slovakia.. . . .	33
Roumania.. . . .	27
Australia.. . . .	26
Jugo-Slavia.. . . .	25
Poland.. . . .	25
Netherlands.. . . .	20

The present scale of contribution is a temporary compromise, based on revenue, population, and other factors; the question of agreeing upon a permanent scale is to be considered by the next assembly. The present scale, while not satisfactory to Canada, is much better than the original provisions, which applied the Universal Postal Union scale; in 1921 Canada had to pay 4.54 per cent of the total budget, in 1925 3.74 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this question to be taken up in the near future?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: At the next assembly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the basis which in the opinion of the government ought to be urged as a permanent basis for contribution?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the different factors that I have mentioned, revenue, population, and the like, would be considerations to be urged.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend will see that that does not quite synchronize with his previous remarks. He has pointed out the adjustments that he considered had been given effect to, but he was not satisfied with the result. My question was, what basis and what percentage is it the view of the government should be urged when these negotiations are taken up at the next meeting? What is the government's stand?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that previously the area of a country was taken into consideration. We have already urged that area is not a proper basis, that population and revenue should rather be the determining factors. I think my hon. friend will agree that the place which Canada holds on the list I have given is relatively where she should be.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says now we are about where we should be.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I say relatively.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not want to quarrel with my hon. friend's terms. I will take it whatever way he puts it. Before he was not satisfied. Is he now satisfied?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was pointing out that Canada is on the same basis as Argentina. I do not think that that is doing Canada an injustice. The next countries below are Brazil and Czecho-Slovakia. I hope we are about equal to either of those countries. There is a difference of only two units between Canada and those two countries. Roumania comes next. We are surely in a little better position than Roumania among the nations of the world. As to the other countries, the larger contributors, Great Britain, France and Italy might be paying a little more on the basis of their population and revenue than they are now, but that is a matter that will have to be taken into account in relation to the actual figures.

Mr. HOEY: Is the expense of maintaining this office increasing or diminishing?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The expenses of the office of the League of Nations were reduced last year by some two or three hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. SHAW: I think there is a matter which is far more important than the mere proportion of expenditure, and that is the question whether or not we are getting anything like