

is the duty of the vendor to see that it is done, but I can imagine a case where the vendor and purchaser might be acting in collusion, and where a charge might possibly be laid against both. The hon. gentleman is quite right, however, the primary intention is to make the vendor liable.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister would not say that every time a man goes into a store to purchase goods, he would have to look up the Act to see whether it was being complied with or not?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, no. The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Naval service—To provide for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Navy, \$300,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I move that the committee consider at the same time in conjunction with this item, item No. 512 in the Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1921, reading as follows:

Naval service—To provide for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Navy—further amount required, \$1,700,000.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I might explain to the committee the reason why the item in the Supplementary Estimates is for \$1,700,000 instead of \$2,200,000 as I stated it would be when naval affairs were under discussion in the House a few days ago. I said then that with an item in the Supplementary Estimates of \$2,200,000 the total maintenance cost for our reorganized navy would be \$2,500,000. Inasmuch as the Rainbow and the Niobe are going out of commission as depot ships, and the cruiser and destroyers will not be here for possibly a month or two, it will be obvious to hon. members that we cannot require as much money for this fiscal year as we shall for the coming year, and therefore I have deducted from the Supplementary Estimates the sum of \$500,000. The amount now appearing in the Supplementary Estimates is \$1,700,000, making a total maintenance cost for naval purposes this year of \$2,000,000.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all very much pleased indeed to learn that the Minister of Naval Affairs

(Mr. Ballantyne) is able to see his way clear to reduce the Supplementary Estimates to the extent of \$500,000. Whilst, of course, we have to accept his explanation of this reduction, I think there is another reason for his having decreased the Estimate to this extent, and that is the fact that we put up such a good opposition the other day in discussing the matter. For that and other reasons I now propose in my own feeble way to endeavour if possible to convince the House that instead of voting \$2,000,000 odd for naval purposes this year we should vote only the exact amount required to settle up naval matters in Halifax, Esquimalt and elsewhere; and we should sell off the Niobe, the Rainbow and other ships and generally clean up the nasty, dirty mess in which matters stand at present. On the 14th of June we had the pleasure of listening to an excellent speech delivered by my esteemed friend the Minister of Naval Affairs, and after the hon. gentleman had concluded his address, I made the suggestion that I thought it would be in the interests of the country to defer further consideration of the item under discussion at the time so that the House and the people of the country might have an opportunity of thoroughly digesting the minister's speech. My hon. friend very graciously acceded to my request, and after I had made a few remarks he moved that the committee rise. And we are again proceeding with the Estimates to-night.

I intend to offer objection to the present proposal on three grounds. First, I do not think that we can afford a navy. Second, I think that what the minister proposes to do now or in the future will be inadequate for defensive purposes; and, third, I am convinced that public opinion is strongly adverse to the proposal, and we certainly should lend an attentive ear to public opinion.

As I say, my first reason is that we cannot afford to spend on naval affairs the money which the minister asks us for. Not only can we ill afford to spend this money, but in my opinion we cannot afford to spend the money which is necessary to demobilize the present so-called navy. In what position do we find ourselves to-day? At the present time our gross debt, if I remember rightly, is somewhere between two and a half and three billion dollars, a staggering liability for a country of small population like Canada as regards population, and ability to pay. What are our expenditures for this year? If any hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates as submitted to the