

be to return her to Great Britain, and I think that was the intention of the Government when the estimate was first laid before the House. I assume, however, that this fine ship is to be tied up to a dock. Some kind of a crew will have to be kept on her; but whether she has a crew or not, she is going to deteriorate very rapidly. The two destroyers, these long knife-like ships, which are not adapted for training purposes, are to be kept as training ships.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the hon. member speak of the Niobe and the Rainbow in the same way?

Mr. GUTHRIE: As training ships the Niobe and Rainbow were excellent. But they are not like the destroyers of modern times, which are in no sense of the word training ships, and which have never been used as such. They are not used except for the special purposes for which they are designed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What was the purpose of the government in acquiring them?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They were acquired as destroyers, as complementary ships to the cruisers.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What were they going to destroy?

Mr. GUTHRIE: A man has to be trained for work on destroyers as well as on other ships.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then they are training ships?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They form part of the auxiliary craft which accompany the cruiser, and certainly you must have some trained men upon such craft. But I would ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to consult his own naval department. If he does so he will ascertain to what extent destroyers are used as training ships. The Aurora is splendidly adapted for the purposes of a training ship, while destroyers are ill adapted. They may be used as a makeshift, and that is evidently the object in view in this case. This good ship, however, is to be tied up at a dock and left to deteriorate.

Mr. CRERAR: Would the hon. member suggest that the cruiser should be used for training purposes and the destroyers tied up?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I suggest that the Government continue to keep them all in com-
[Mr. Guthrie.]

mission. It is poor economy to allow these vessels to deteriorate under the circumstances, when a real benefit would accrue from maintaining them in the modest way in which they have been maintained in the past. Now what is to happen to the submarines? They are to be tied up at the docks, I suppose. Any one who inquires into the matter will discover that a submarine tied to the dock rapidly depreciates. A submarine has certain delicate gas, electric and other machinery which has to be operated occasionally to be kept in trim. If allowed to stand idle, without being occasionally submerged and tested, the machinery gets out of order, and after a very protracted period of disuse the vessel becomes absolutely useless. I have brought these matters to the attention of the committee only because I felt, since the debate in the House last Tuesday, that probably a wrong impression had gone abroad about these ships. I believe they are suitable in every way for the purposes for which they were procured.

I should like to know what was the entire cost of the naval service last year. If, as has been suggested by a morning paper in this city to-day, the whole expenditure last year was only two million dollars or thereabouts, surely my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) could manage to keep the service going for another year without any great strain upon the treasury. There are undoubtedly other avenues and other departments in which we could lop off half a million dollars in order to maintain this service. I make an appeal to the minister. I do not suppose it will have any effect, but I appeal to him that in his treatment of the men whom he is going to let out, these young men who have been trained and are now qualified and ready for lieutenantancies or higher ranks, he will make sure that they are not cast adrift. I hope he will accord them very generous treatment. They have gone into the naval service with the best of intentions. The naval course is hard and exacting and they have gone through with it successfully and now that they are qualified for lieutenant's rank, are they suddenly to be told, "You can cut loose, we are done with you"? They should certainly be generously treated, and I appeal to the minister accordingly.

Mr. DUFF: I want to say a word in answer to the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I am glad, and I am sure the committee is glad, to get the