

first, that Imperial unity depends upon local autonomy, which contribution would violate but which the policy of a Canadian navy would conserve; secondly, that racial conditions in Canada make contribution foolish and impracticable, for a united Empire can be gained only by a united Canada; and thirdly, that financial contribution violates the very foundation of responsible government, the absolute control of taxes by the taxed. He quoted constitutional authorities to show that this infringement of constitution principles would lead to disastrous consequences. From these three political arguments, Mr. Baker concluded that the policy of the negative would best conserve the unity and permanence of the Empire. Therefore, from an Imperial standpoint, it was politically superior to financial contribution. Mr. Baker's arguments were convincing, his manner of presentation pleasing.

Mr. Guy opened the debate for Mt. Allison by pointing out that the existence of Canada depended on Britain's supremacy of the sea, and (only thus must the question of Canada's naval policy be viewed. The naval supremacy of Britain, so long unquestioned, is now seriously menaced. Germany avowedly is building a powerful navy to contest Britain's supremacy, and the race for naval control is now progressing. In the future only Dreadnoughts and Super-Dreadnoughts will be of decisive value in a great engagement. By giving her cash contribution, therefore, to the British navy, Canada would be strengthening that navy. Germany, too, is building their ships at a faster rate than England. The admiralty laid two policies before the colonies, one being that by a financial contribution a single navy with the concomitant unity of training and command might be maintained, and the other being that if a colony desired to have a navy of its own, that naval force should consist of a fleet unit of which the essential part should be a Dreadnought, and that this should be the first ship built. Australia and New Zealand adopted the second scheme, but Canada refused both, preferring a few small ships which would be useless in time of war. Mr. Guy's speech was characterized by clear thinking, and was well delivered.

Mr. Illsley followed for Acadia. He took up the second issue laid down by the negative, and argued that the Empire would gain more in sea-power by a Canadian navy policy than by financial contribution. This he substantiated by three arguments. First, in the far future, Canada simply would not give her financial support to contribution because of lack of national interest. Australia's case proved this