

on pre-war lines would mean an expenditure of \$1,500,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I purpose taking, and I think we are justified in taking, the Government at their own word as the minister presented his statement on the naval situation, not as he brings it down in the dying days of this session. The minister, in bringing down his statement, said that Canada's very heavy financial commitments are a consideration. We purpose taking that view of the matter, and we would ask the minister to confine his expenditure on naval matters to what he intimated he was going to ask for at the time he made that statement. We ask him that because we believe Canada's financial commitments are very heavy at this time. This year we can afford to economise in some directions, while we cannot afford to economise in others. We possibly cannot avoid an expenditure of thirty or forty million dollars on demobilization, but we can avoid an expenditure of \$2,500,000 in regard to those vessels the minister hopes to have temporarily in commission. The minister said further:

In view of Canada's heavy financial commitments and of the fact that Britain has not as yet decided on her permanent naval policy, and of the approaching Imperial Conference at which the question of naval defence of the Empire will come up for discussion between the Home Government and the Overseas Dominions, it has been decided to defer in the meantime action in regard to the adoption of a permanent naval policy for Canada.

We say: If the minister has decided to defer this permanent naval policy until this conference, we think we are justified in asking him to defer in the meantime further expenditures on the navy than what is absolutely necessary to keep in existence the nucleus which may have to be continued after a permanent policy has been determined upon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is Britain doing that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Britain has her policies to consider; we have our policies to consider. Great Britain has unquestionably certain matters to consider as regards her navy, having regard to her insular position and the equipment which she has, matters which are wholly different from the consideration of which we in this country have to take account at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My point is this. Is it not true, as set forth in the statement, that Britain's permanent naval policy has not been finally adopted? Is it not also true

that Britain is doing as we are doing now, voting money to support a temporary policy in the meantime?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think, if my hon. friend compares Britain's military and naval expenditures to-day with her pre-war expenditures, he will find that the former are considerably less.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Less!

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): Nearly double.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are far more.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Of course, there is the enormous upkeep of vessels in commission built during the war, vessels which Great Britain has not yet got completely rid of and some of which she is presenting to us at the present time and which my hon. friend wishes to relieve her of. But I do not think my hon. friend will find that Great Britain is entering upon any enlargement of the programme which she had when she came out of the war. That is the point I am making. What my hon. friend proposes to do is to take a naval condition which we have at the end of the war and to enlarge upon that very materially.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): Might I—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): Well, the leader of the Opposition has made a statement, and I am sure he would not object to the correct figures being placed upon Hansard. I merely wish to say that the British Naval Estimates provide for an expenditure this year of £96,590,181, or \$482,950,905, as against £53,573,261, or \$267,866,305 provided for in 1914-15.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend tell us what proportion of that is for the upkeep of ships built during the war, ships which Great Britain cannot afford to dispense with at the present time, and what part of it is for new constructive work, something entirely new in the way of additions to the British navy? Then, he will get the contrast I am endeavouring to point, which is this. What the minister is proposing now is that we should take a condition which we have at the present moment and enlarge upon it by fresh expenditures. I am contending that all Great Britain is doing is to continue what she found herself with at the end of the war, but that she is not enlarging her programme.