

would be better not to say that we would take them back again. The reason my hon. friend gives for wanting these ships to at once become the property of the Mother Country is that we owe so much. How much do we owe?—possibly \$350,000,000, and we are to give them ships worth \$35,000,000 to pay the debt—ten cents on the dollar. My hon. friend will have nine more opportunities of voting for a contribution of this kind before the debt is paid. You cannot pay debts and keep your respectability with ten cents on the dollar.

Mr. STEVENS: Will you do it any better by paying nothing?

Mr. McCRAANEY: My hon. friend asks if we are prepared to give nothing. He has sat not only silent but asleep. Does he not understand that we on this side of the House, and we have been challenged for it, are willing to spend many million dollars more than this programme which he and his friends have put forward calls for, and we are not only willing to expend the money but we are willing to maintain the ships and to man them with our own men. We are willing to take that part in the defence of the Empire which necessity may require.

What is the reason of this demand for \$35,000,000? It is this union with the Nationalists. There may be co-operation between the old political parties in this House who may differ in their methods, but who, I hope hold the same true ideals of nationhood.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would like to ask my hon. friend if he insists that the Nationalists wish to destroy Canadian autonomy?

Mr. McCRAANEY: I did not hear the question of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BURNHAM: My hon. friend insists that this policy of ours is due to the Nationalists and since, as he says, this policy is so destructive of Canadian autonomy, does he say that the desire of the Nationalists is to destroy Canadian autonomy.

Mr. McCRAANEY: I think myself that that is the conclusion to which it will lead if it goes through and that is why we are fighting here to prevent it. I believe that not only can the historic parties co-operate in policy but there can be continuity in policy. We can, though differing in detail, uphold the same ideals and stand by the same principles. But I say that no self-respecting party can make a union with the Nationalists of this country, in view of the declarations which were made by them and the attitude they took towards Imperial matters before the last election, and preserve their respectability. The thing that stands out to his credit is the

fidelity of the Prime Minister who feels that he is bound by his pledges and who endeavours to carry them out. As far as this present scheme is concerned, it is the result of that unfortunate union. We are now asked to pay the price, we are asked to deliver the goods, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are surprised that we should make use of any constitutional means that come to our hand to prevent this measure going through. I think that hon. members on the other side would lose their respect for us, as they must have lost some for themselves in their union with the Nationalists, if they thought that we would do anything else than fight it to the bitter end.

Mr. J. E. MARCILE (Bagot): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, let me say at once that I am happy to address you a few remarks on Bill No. 21, now before this committee, providing a contribution of thirty-five millions of dollars for the British Admiralty, with the hope that this time my remarks and those before submitted to you will have the effect to convince the Government of its error and bring the abandonment of the Bill.

It has been alleged, when this Bill was first submitted, that there was urgency. A little later, the urgency was changed to a need, and now there is nothing at all, no more urgency, no more need; there only remains the determination not to retrace one's steps, although it is admitted that the measure is useless.

I had been led to believe, Mr. Speaker, seeing the suspension of the Bill at the beginning of April, that the Government would not persist in its obstinacy to have that measure adopted, knowing quite well as we do that it is contrary to the interests of the Canadian people and also to the general wishes of the citizens of this country.

Let me hope, Mr. Speaker, that after the remarks I have to submit and those already submitted by the hon. members of the Opposition, that the Government will take them into serious consideration, and that it will lay all pride aside and adjourn Bill No. 21 for further consideration, with the hope that it will never again make its appearance.

The first consideration I have to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this committee, is that in adopting the principle of this alleged Naval Aid Bill, and specially clause 4 under consideration, we are entering a path which will lead us where no one knows, a path which takes us more and more afar from the right one which the fathers of Confederation had traced for us. In fact, Mr. Speaker, do you believe that the provinces of Quebec, of New Brunswick, of Nova Scotia, and of Prince Edward Island would have consented to enter into Confederation if promises had not been given them