

dern, thoroughly well equipped, up-to-date in every way, and exactly suitable for the purpose to which we are putting them.

An hon. MEMBER: When were they built?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will take the largest of them first. The Aurora is described as a light cruiser, adapted for coast, river and harbour defence. I assume that that is what we want particularly. She is an oil-burner, built in 1914, and her armament is as follows: Two six-inch guns; six four-inch guns; one four-inch anti-aircraft gun; eight torpedoes. She has a speed of 28.5 knots.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think she has exceeded that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: She has at present a complement of 19 officers and 307 men, the great majority of whom are Canadians. I think I am correct in saying that 13 officers and 230 or 235 men are Canadians, but I cannot establish the correctness of those figures by the latest reports. She is a very fast ship, and the minister, I think, intimated a moment ago that she had attained a greater speed than 28.5 knots an hour. She is particularly adapted for the work which we require in Canada. She is an excellent training ship, an excellent coast and harbour defence ship, modern in every respect.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Am I not right in understanding that that ship is of the Arethusa type? And if so, is it not true that she is the only ship of that type in active commission at the present time, and that other ships of that type are at present being scrapped?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot give the information to my hon. friend, but I think he has been in his department long enough to get the information.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think that is the fact.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Aurora was not in Dominion waters either during or after the war, and she could not be one of the ships referred to in the statement made by that witness before that committee. The ships in Dominion waters were the Sheerwater and the Algerine.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The statement said "usually" not "always".

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Aurora never was.

Mr. DUFF: That is right. She never was.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) says that I am right, and he probably knows.

Mr. DUFF: Right, for once.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, we agree for once. The two destroyers, the Patricia and the Patriot, are what are called sister ships. They are both oil-burners, built in 1916. Their armament is as follows: Three four-inch guns; one two pounder; five machine guns and four torpedoes. They have a speed of 35 knots an hour, and each of them a complement of five officers and 76 men, the majority on each ship being Canadians. Neither of these ships was ever in Canadian waters, either during or after the war. The two submarines are known as the C.H. 14, and the C.H. 15. They were built in October, 1918. They have each a complement of 3 officers and 18 men, nearly all of whom, I think, are Canadians. They are both thoroughly modern in every respect. These are the five ships which were transferred by the British navy to Canada within the last year or two, and which have been kept in commission since then by the Dominion of Canada. I am informed that the total expense in connection with the naval service, including the maintenance of these ships, is in round figures, only about \$2,000,000 a year. The statement appeared this morning in one of the daily papers that \$2,000,000 would cover the whole outlay, although \$2,500,000 was the appropriation. I have not seen the returns and I cannot verify the figures. I know, however, what the maintenance was. To-day the Government submitted answers to the following questions:

What was the expenditure for 1921 on the cruiser Aurora and the two destroyers Patriot and Patricia, (a) for repairs, (b) for maintenance, (c) for equipment and supplies, and (d) for pay and allowances?

The answer was that the total under all these heads for the Aurora was \$819,516; for the Patriot, \$267,294; and for the Patricia, \$254,227; a grand total, on the three ships, of \$1,541,037. No question was asked in regard to the two submarines, and no answer was given in respect of them; but I would imagine that the expenditure in regard to the submarines would be much less than in regard to the other three ships.

The proposal now is to take that cruiser and practically tie her up, to disband her crew. You cannot keep a crew on a ship tied up to a dock. The alternative would