

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): That is a mistake in the wording of the item.

Mr. BENNETT: It should be corrected. The item simply states that it is to provide for the maintenance of the ships.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): This item is for the purchase of the two ships.

Mr. LAWSON: There is no mention of maintenance in the item.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It is to cover the purchase price, some refitting in England, and the cost of sending the Canadian crews to England.

Mr. HEAPS: What will be the total cost of these boats when they are completed?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The total cost will be \$2,201,000 less the amount necessary for personnel expenses. The actual price is \$1,068,000 each, which includes a certain amount for refitting.

Mr. HEAPS: What will be the total maintenance cost for these boats?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Because of their larger size, there will be an additional maintenance cost of about \$330,000 per annum for the two boats.

Mr. HEAPS: That is over and above what it cost to maintain the other two?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): That is correct.

Mr. HEAPS: What will be the total cost of maintaining the two new boats?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The maintenance of each destroyer will run to about \$272,175 per annum.

Mr. GREEN: One of the old destroyers, which I understand are to be broken up, was named the Vancouver. The suggestion has been made that some memento from that ship should be given to the city of Vancouver. Will the minister take this suggestion under consideration?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I shall be delighted to see that it is carried out.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the item should contain the proper description before we vote the money. Put it in some sort of shape which adequately explains what it is for.

Mr. DUNNING: I move, Mr. Chairman, an amendment to the wording of the item, to read as follows:

To provide for the purchase and refitting of two destroyers for the Royal Canadian Navy.

Mr. MacNEIL: What is the total personnel of each destroyer?

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I gave that information in full in the main estimates. I believe I have it here. The total involved, on the estimates of this year, will be 1,212 officers and men of the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve, and 1,339 officers and men of the Royal Canadian Navy, an increase in the Royal Canadian Volunteer Reserve of 161, and in the other branch, of 373, or a total increase of 534.

Mr. STIRLING: Would the minister be good enough to report progress on the mine sweepers?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): As far as mine sweepers are concerned, it is expected that tenders will be called for within the next two weeks for their construction in Canada.

Mr. STIRLING: Both east and west?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It is expected to divide construction territorially as far as possible.

Mr. BENNETT: This seems to me an opportune moment to make a few observations with reference to our naval policy. I was hopeful that the minister would regard it as desirable to postpone any definite commitments to purchase mine sweepers or other naval craft until such time as he had had an opportunity to discuss matters with the British admiralty. I also desire to point out that during the recent weeks we on this side of the house have refrained from making any observations on this subject believing that the government was best able to determine what was desirable in the public interest with respect to defence. But I have long felt that it is desirable that there should be some measure of agreement between parties with respect to this matter. Feeling that as strongly as I do, we refrained from pointing out that the secret memorandum to which the minister referred in connection with the military estimates was one that had been prepared and delivered to the then Prime Minister in May of 1935, and that in consequence of armament having followed disarmament efforts we were in a different situation from what we had hitherto been in.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): There were two memoranda—one in 1932 and one in 1935.

Mr. BENNETT: I am dealing with 1935. In speaking of the naval situation I purpose to refrain from making any observations that can be regarded as contentious; rather I am going to rely entirely upon quotations from the speeches of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, both when

in office and out of it, for the purpose of endeavouring to direct the attention of the committee to the importance of our having a clearer appreciation of what has been done in Canada in days gone by with respect to naval defence, what our commitments are at the moment, and why, in the language of that great leader of the Liberal party, we should pursue a policy of close cooperation as respects naval defence with the British authorities.

In 1909 Sir George Foster—then Mr. Foster—moved in this house a resolution on naval defence. It will be found in the journals of the House of Commons of March 29, 1909. It was seconded by Mr. Haggart, of South Lanark, and is in the following terms:

That in the opinion of this house, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

On that occasion Sir George Foster made a speech which Sir Wilfrid Laurier described in 1913 as one of the best of the many good speeches he had made. Sir Wilfrid at that time did not think that Sir George Foster's resolution went far enough, so he moved in his own language an amendment, seconded by Mr. Paterson, and in his discussions he had the aid also of Sir George Foster in making certain other additions to the resolution finally adopted, which was in these words:

This house fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

The house is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The house will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in cooperation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

The house expressed its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty cooperation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

That was carried unanimously, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier refers to it in a speech from which I desire to make a few quotations. Next year Sir Wilfrid Laurier's administration placed upon the statute books the naval law of Canada. The act, which is chapter 43 of the statutes of 1910, is well known, I take it, to most hon. members; its short title is the Naval Service Act. This act provided practically for a Canadian navy. In 1911, before his administration was defeated, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Service Act, called for tenders for four cruisers and six destroyers to be built in Canada. Those ships were tendered for, and the date fixed for the expiration of the receipt of tenders was in the fall of 1911. As a matter of fact the day fell after the defeat of his administration and Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not accept the tenders.

In 1912 the government of Sir Robert Borden considered the question of our naval defence, and in consequence of the information imparted to the representatives of his government introduced into the House of Commons a resolution providing for the construction of three dreadnoughts at an expenditure of \$35,000,000. That was done on the basis of an alleged emergency. Sir Wilfrid Laurier denied that there was an emergency, and upon that question the parties joined issue. During the course of the debate Sir Wilfrid made a speech to which I should like to direct the attention of this committee, for in that speech he reviewed the past in the light of seventy years of a life which he said he hoped he had not lived in vain, and he gave to the Canadian people his view of their obligation and duty in relation to naval defence.

At page 1022 of Hansard of December 12, 1912, Sir Wilfrid referring to the resolution introduced by Mr. Foster speaks as follows:

When four years ago my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) introduced this subject in a concrete form, we were in control of the house, and the house will agree with me that we did not receive his motion in any carping spirit. The motion moved by my hon. friend was to this effect.

Then he read the resolution which I quoted a few moments ago. He went on:

We received the proposition of my hon. friend quite sympathetically, and we suggested to him that it would be advisable to enlarge it and to bring it to the broader basis of imperial defence, in view especially of the new conditions which were then and had been for some time arising in Europe. I am bound to say that our suggestion was well received by our friends on the other side, and they in turn offered us some amendments, which we were

D 32892

D 32893