Chamberlainism; the label 'Canadian' on the fleet could not conceal the fact that it was a disguised contribution to the imperial navy, a pledge of Canadian participation in all British wars, an assumption of all the consequences of a policy in which Canadians had little interest and over which they had no control. Other Conservatives attacked the government's proposals as a useless waste, a strategic heresy, a declaration of independence, the beginning of the break-up of the Empire, a weak concession to French-Canadian disloyalty: 'one flag, one fleet, one throne' was their ideal".(1)

Dr. Skelton summarizes this important issue in these words: "The debate ranged wide. There were many notable utterances. Never before had Canada's relation to the Empire or her place in the world been discussed so thoroughly in parliament. Yet there was an inability to find common ground, or a haziness and uncertainty of view, that prevented a very helpful or definite conclusion. The debate made evident how imperative was the policy Sir Wilfrid Laurier advocated, of emphasizing Canadian nationhood and at the same time seeking to reconcile nationhood and Empire. British racialism and French racialism, imperialist and nationalist, were alike barriers to Canadian unity. . . The debate also made evident how difficult this policy was to work out in practice, how ambiguous was Canada's international situation,

<sup>(1) &</sup>lt;u>Ibid</u>, p.329. (Skelton).

See also Glazebrook: op. cit. pp.281-2.