

contention. It was backed up by both common sense and experience. Second, in the near future, we could build a navy which would be a valuable addition to Imperial sea-power; valuable in three ways: by establishing docking, fitting and coaling stations for British ships; by protecting commerce against raiders; by forming a nucleus for a mighty navy of the future. In the third place Mr. Illsley argued that contribution would in the near future mean no addition to Imperial sea-power, because the money would merely relieve the British taxpayer, and would not increase the British navy. This contention he supported by statistics and authorities. Therefore, Mr. Illsley concluded, in the near future and in the far future, the Empire would gain more in sea-power by the policy of a Canadian navy than by the policy of financial contribution. Mr. Illsley's speech was a splendid instance of thorough argument delivered convincingly.

Mr. Ruggles, for Mt. Allison, supported the policy of the affirmative, first, because it would mean far more effective aid to the Empire in speed and efficiency of construction. England is equipped to build warships quickly and efficiently, and in the present situation this fact is of vital importance. He then attacked the economic argument of the negative, stating that to build warships in Canada would cost one-third more than in England, and this would be a bonussing of an industry which would prove to be unnatural. He claimed that the wisest policy would be to bonus a mercantile marine. This was what Germany had done, by first building up a strong mercantile marine. Only then did she attempt to construct warships. He supported his contention with numerous statistics, and showed that Germany had wonderfully developed her industries without the warship industry. Maintenance of a Canadian navy would also be costly, at least fifty per cent. more costly than in England. Canada has big projects in hand, and can ill afford to adopt such a wasteful policy as that supported by the negative. Mr. Ruggles speech was well worked out and delivered in a strong manner.

Mr. Howe, for Acadia, said that his colleagues had considered the vital interests of Empire. He would take up the third division of the case of the negative and would consider the vital interests of Canada herself.

He said that the Canadian problem was the development of the Maritime Provinces, which were actually going behind in comparison with the rest of the Dominion; that the bulk of the Canadian navy