

for this amendment who ought to think for one moment of supporting it; they all ought to ask to have it withdrawn.

Comparisons or contrasts of the kind are however beside the question. Either money is needed for purposes of defence or it is not. What we propose to spend on defence is not to be justified by comparison with anything else, it is to be justified with respect to the needs of defence alone. It could be justified in all these other ways if one wished to do so, but my point is that any criticism of the government in respect to the defence estimates must be made on the score of what we are spending for defence in the light of the world situation as we know it and of Canada's position as we know it in reference to dangers that may arise. I should like to ask hon. members of the group opposite if any one of them to-day will rise in his seat and say that in the light of the world situation, as he understands it, he thinks we are spending too much for defence in Canada at this time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is the position we take. I do not need to reiterate it. I think it is simple nonsense to be spending as much as we are.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, if that is the position my hon. friend takes, he has not had the courage to put it in his amendment. That is just the criticism I make of the amendment. I know very well what is going to happen as time slips along. Let the dangers increase to some extent, and what will hon. members say who support this amendment? "Oh, we never opposed the amount of money that the government was proposing to spend for defence."

Mr. WOODSWORTH: You will see, when we come to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: "All we did was to say that the contrast between what was being spent for defence and what was being spent for social services was a matter of concern."

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): We are concerned about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me now come to what we are proposing to spend for purposes of defence, and why the amount is what it is. And just here may I say that governments are necessarily controlled, in the matters which they submit to parliament, by the actual conditions with which their countries may be faced at any particular time. When

a government brings in its estimates it does not bring in just what it pleases or what pleases it most. It has regard to conditions as they exist, and must consider what is necessary, and what it believes the people of the country believe to be necessary properly to meet those conditions. If there were no dangers in the world at the present time, if there were no threat of international war, if there were no impending calamity on a scale such as everyone, who is reflecting on the world situation, realizes that there is, certainly it would be an extraordinary thing for the government to bring in increases in defence estimates. But when countries are facing an altogether new situation, a government which has responsibility for defence must assume that responsibility in the light of existing conditions.

To understand why the defence estimates contain the increases they do, it is necessary to take account not merely of what has happened within the last year or two, but to view the world situation as it has developed in the years since the war. Quickly reviewing conditions, as they are known to all, we can see the reason why, for a considerable period of time, defence estimates were kept at a very low figure, and also why, at the present time, estimates have had to be increased not only by Canada but by countries all over the world that are seeking to maintain their liberties and freedom and free institutions.

After the war, when the treaty of Versailles had been negotiated and signed, and there was brought into being the League of Nations, the world was war weary. There was not a nation which had not had enough of war—as sentiment was reflected in the minds of most of its people—for all time. The world looked for some other means of settling differences which might arise and saw in the League of Nations an institution that seemed to give promise of relieving nations from the necessity of competitive arming in the future. Here, they thought, was an institution that, by bringing into its membership all the nations of the world, would be in a position through the collective security it would ensure to avoid the necessity of any one nation arming against another. The vision was so compelling that it seemed to create the very conditions that were needed for its fulfilment. People did not stop to ask themselves very seriously whether this means of security upon which they were relying, which the league was to bring into being, would actually meet the situation; they were satisfied to accept it. The peoples of the different countries were ready to abandon old methods of settling disputes and to adopt the new and