

posals of the Government. That their refusal to accept that policy in whole or in part will lead to any definite results is quite improbable. We repeat, a Canadian navy, built mainly in Canada, controlled in time of peace by Canada, and manned so far as is possible by Canadians, is now assured.

A FRIEND in Winnipeg protests against our editorial of December 25th on Mr. Roblin's famous "Tin-pot Navy" speech. He describes our comment as "a studied, cynical, insulting and contemptuous personal attack on a prominent Manitoban." This is decisive, to say the least. Our critic contends that instead of honest criticism we substituted "Studied insult" both in that issue and in a subsequent one.

Allow us to say in reply that we do not remember, nor can we find any record of a word of personal criticism of Mr. Roblin, either as a man or as a Premier, in the two articles in question. Mr. Roblin himself said that he spoke as a private citizen, not as premier, and we were bound to respect that statement. We did respect it. We made no reference to any question in Manitoba politics nor to any attitude of the honourable gentleman with the exception of what was exhibited in his public address. Our correspondent is wrong in stating that we reflected upon Mr. Roblin's sincerity. That part of the charge we deny.

We did laugh at Mr. Roblin, when he quoted Ex-Senator Chauncey Depew as his sole authority for stating that a war between Germany and England was imminent. We are still laughing. Mr. Borden later made the same assertion as Mr. Roblin, but backed it up with statements made by Mr. Asquith and other prominent statesmen of Great Britain. We do not laugh at Mr. Borden. His evidence was reasonable even if not conclusive.

Indeed, in Mr. Borden's magnificent speech in the House last week, one of the best he has ever made, he took the same attitude as the "Courier" on two points. First, he said a Canadian navy would not, in his opinion, lead to a severance of our connection with the Empire. Secondly, he argued that a Canadian navy was no more likely to embroil us in trouble with our neighbours or with the Empire, than the Canadian militia. These, indeed, were chief among the points which we made against Mr. Roblin's attitude. In both cases, Mr. Borden's attitude is exactly the same as ours. How, then can we be accused of partisanship?

We respect Mr. Roblin as a successful Canadian premier. We have no criticism to offer upon his personal qualities or his personal record as a public man. On this Canadian navy question, we believe he has gone wrong. Further, he has carried most of the West with him and thus has led them astray also. In admitting that the West is largely with Mr. Roblin in his attitude towards a Canadian navy, we believe we are paying him a high compliment. This does not, nevertheless, prevent our saying that we feel impelled to oppose his arguments with all the vigour and skill which we possess. This is a national question of the gravest importance and the Canadian Courier would be untrue to its purpose and its opportunities, if it were to remain neutral at the present moment.

SIR THOMAS SHAUGHNESSY'S plan to provide ready-made homes for hand-picked British immigrants is attracting much attention. It looks as if Sir Thomas had taken a leaf out of the notebook of General Booth. When one of these fortunates is selected, a house is built for him, the land is broken and sown for a first crop. The company is to be repaid in annual instalments with the land as security. Supposing the initial cost to be \$4,000, the new farmer would pay \$400 a year for ten years. But the new man, Sir Thomas insists, shall have at least \$500 capital.

THE Canadian ultra-imperialists who have been shouting for tariff reform and gifts of Dreadnoughts ought to be thoroughly silenced by the election returns from Great Britain. Tariff preference by Great Britain in favour of the colonies is still a dream of the future. The people of the Motherland believe themselves quite capable of getting along without either colonial advice or colonial assistance. To send the money for Dreadnoughts to a people in such a mood would be distinctly bad form.

Canada can best preserve her reputation and her self-respect and can best improve her standing within the Empire by continuing to frame her politics nationally. Australia and New Zealand are doing this. South Africa is doing it. So is Great Britain. Each part of

the Empire is developing in its own way, and following the policies which will give it the greatest national strength.

The simplicity and clarity of such a statement is its greatest recommendation. As soon as one part of the Empire begins to interfere with another, complications will arise and frictions will follow. So long as Canada keeps her advice on Britain's domestic affairs in cold storage, so long will our relations continue pleasant. Britain steadily refuses to interfere in purely domestic colonial affairs, and the colonies will do well to reciprocate.

Opinions on the Naval Question

Kingston Whig:—"Sir Wilfrid represents a sentiment that finds higher expression than the occasional waving of flags. There are two kinds of loyalty—the one that ends in talking and the one that ends in action. Of the one kind the Canadian people have had quite enough."

Winnipeg Free Press:—"As the debate goes on and other Conservative members state their views to Parliament and the country, perhaps Mr. Borden will gradually supply the explanation necessary to make his speech intelligent. Meanwhile, he and his party stand before the country without a coherent naval policy."

Halifax Herald:—"Sir Wilfrid's proposed vessels are not fighting ships, are fit for no place in the first line of defence of the Empire; but it is fighting ships that Britain wants to be prepared for the threatened emergency—battleships, armoured cruisers, such as *Indomitables* and *Shannons*. For the supply of any such ships Sir Wilfrid has nothing but refusals."

Stratford Herald:—"The fatal error of the Naval Bill, while it goes in the right direction by making a beginning at a navy, is its shabby disregard of dignity and gratitude. The *Dreadnought* is the feature which above all Canada ought to commit herself to."

Kingston Standard:—"A Canadian navy will commit us to a policy of expenditure and extravagance indefinitely. On the other hand a policy of direct contribution to the Empire commits us merely to a policy of contribution which need not be continued indefinitely."

St. John Sun:—"These facts amply justify Sir Wilfrid Laurier's contention that Canada's plain duty is to plan for the permanent future, not for an imaginary emergency now. Britain is not tottering. Canada offers co-operation, not charity."

Fredericton Gleaner:—"Sir Wilfrid desires to go down to posterity as the originator of the Canadian navy; all else is as naught. There can be no question that the proper thing for Canada to do is to place a cash contribution at the disposal of the British Admiralty."

Ottawa Journal:—"The *Journal* believed and believes that Canada can and should do more than either Australia or New Zealand, for the cause of the Empire. Is it necessary for us to be so much 'on the cheap' in this matter?"

Windsor Record:—"It looks as if the Government were being weakly driven into this expenditure by fear of the loyalty cant of the jingo element in and outside of the Conservative party. The *Record* believes that if the people were given an opportunity for expression at the polls they would be found in substantial agreement with Mr. Monk on this question."

London Advertiser:—"Mr. Monk's reasoning will not be accepted by the great majority of Canadians. They will agree with Sir Wilfrid Laurier that war against Great Britain must be war against Canada, on the principle of a United Empire. The sentiment of Quebec will rather incline to the National-Imperial attitude of Sir Wilfrid Laurier."

Hamilton Times:—"It is quite clear that the Opposition is far from united on the question of naval defence. The one point on which the party seems to agree is that whatever policy the Government seeks to undertake must be opposed."

St. John Telegraph:—"Political enemies have called Sir Wilfrid Laurier a Separatist. His words are those of a good patriot. The small group of men who have been saying that the creation of a Canadian navy is a movement towards separation, have their answer. The voluntary proposal of Canada is to place eleven new ships of war under the flag at a cost of \$15,000,000."

Toronto Star:—"It is altogether likely that the navy will cost Canada a great deal more, as time goes on, than three million dollars a year. But in embarking upon an entirely new policy, an initial expenditure of at least eleven million dollars and an annual expenditure of three million dollars will hardly strike the impartial observer as insignificant or contemptible. We did not, when we began to build railways, lay out the plans for a transcontinental railway."

Montreal La Patrie:—"The opinion of the Province of Quebec for the past few months has not shown itself so visibly hostile. In whatever case, Quebec will not cast off her part of the burden. French-Canadians are unfortunately placed to express clearly their views. We still have to defend ourselves nearly every day against certain shadowy persons who are inclined to suspect us of disloyalty. It is, perhaps, because of this continued distrust that French-Canadian opinions, at certain times, seem to bend before the silent intimidation which they feel. We suppose the federal government has given careful thought to the matter before placing the marine project before the chamber, because an immediate appropriation of 3 per cent. of her revenue should not be accepted without reflection, an appropriation which will in the future grow faster than the revenue beyond a doubt. We had believed not so long ago that public opinion was more in favour of a Canadian navy."