

# REFLECTIONS

CANADIANS should be careful not to misunderstand the attitude of Australia and New Zealand in regard to Naval Defence. Dreadnoughtism has not taken possession of these sister colonies to the extent that a few over-enthusiastic Imperialists would have us believe. Some of the despatches have been most misleading. At times we have been led to believe that the two governments had wired orders to London to lay the keels for Southern Cross *Dreadnoughts*, to be presented to the British Government as soon as completed. The truth is that their attitude is much the same as Canada's. They are willing to help the Empire in every reasonable way; they are willing to co-operate with the British naval authorities in a deliberate and justifiable manner; but they refuse to be stampeded by sudden British notions which are more or less political and more or less ephemeral.



COLONEL FOXTON, Australia's delegate to the Imperial defence conference, has sailed for London. It will probably be found that he will support Canada's contention that the colonial contributions should take the form of colonial defence, colonial naval bases and colonial coaling stations. He will probably support also the idea that these auxiliary colonial fleets shall be constructed and managed on general imperial lines, so as to make imperial co-operation always possible.

New Zealand, because of the great influence exercised by the late Mr. Seddon, is probably more enthusiastic over Imperial Defence, and less inclined to insist on colonial autonomy in this respect than the other colonies. Nevertheless, it will probably be found that all the self-governing colonies are practically unanimous.



ONE Canadian delegate to the Press Conference intimated that Canada had not pursued a self-respecting policy in regard to naval contributions. That delegate may think his statement quite proper, but there are many people who think it decidedly improper. It was spoken by him in a representative capacity at a semi-official public function. It was neither the time nor the place to cast discredit upon his country's conduct and upon the attitude of his own fellow-citizens towards naval contributions.

Somewhere about 1879, Sir John A. Macdonald decided to build the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Vancouver. That road cost Canada one hundred and fifty million dollars. Supposing, instead of doing that, he had invested that amount of money in battleships and cruisers, would he have done more for the Defence of the Empire? Is not the C. P. R. to-day a greater asset in Imperial Defence than fifteen or twenty battleships and cruisers of the vintage of 1879-1880? Will not the National Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific which will cost Canada in pledged credit and cash nearly two hundred million dollars, be an equally important link in Imperial Defence? These two railways will enable Canada to defend itself more effectively if it is ever called upon to do so. They will enable British troops to be moved across the North American continent if it is ever necessary that they should travel in that direction. They connect the British forces on the Pacific Ocean with the British forces on the Atlantic Ocean. They are truly Imperial contributions.



THIS answer to the charge of niggardliness may be further enlarged by pointing to our military expenditures. Australia and New Zealand being island nations and having no international boundary lines to consider, have paid little attention to their land forces. Their expenditures in this direction have been small, which accounts for their naval reserve establishments and their cash contributions to the British navy. Great Britain never maintained a land force in those countries in the sense that she did in Canada. Therefore the contributions of the colonies differed. Australia and New Zealand contributed by relieving Great Britain of a portion of the naval expense; Canada contributed by relieving Great Britain of a portion of the military expense. British troops at Esquimaux, Quebec and Halifax once cost the British treasury a considerable annual sum; to-day that expense is borne by Canada.

The man who points out how much more Australia has done than Canada is unfamiliar with the facts. If he knew his history, he would

find that Canada has made permanent contributions of exceptional value.



BEFORE 1902, it was thought by Imperialists that the colonies would contribute money and men and Great Britain would do the defending. Canada's attitude at the Colonial Conference of that year proved that this scheme was practically impossible. The self-governing colonies were not willing to be considered dependents looking entirely to Great Britain for direction and protection. They desired to be considered self-sustaining nations in alliance with the Motherland. It was Canada's premier who in 1902 spoke of the British Empire as "a galaxy of independent nations." He did not invent the idea, but he made the phrase. The idea was in the air, and he translated it into words.

The enthusiastic Imperial-Federationists of the day were dismayed. They feared it meant independence or separation. They have, however, gradually learned that it does not necessarily involve either. The affection for the Motherland, the willingness to sacrifice something in the common cause is as great to-day as ever. Colonial nationalism is not incompatible with Imperialism, though it has destroyed the hope of an Imperial Federation with Great Britain as the dominant factor.



IN 1905, there was published a remarkable book, written by an Englishman, a correspondent of the *Morning Post* who spent three years in the colonies studying the question. It was entitled "Studies in Colonial Nationalism," and the writer was Mr. Richard Jebb, a nephew of Sir Richard Jebb. On the opening page he says:

"In Canada, Australia and New Zealand, the national idea is discernible in different degrees of development, depending upon conditions which vary in each case. Generally speaking, the popular attitude towards the mother country is becoming different in kind to that which prevailed a generation ago. Colonial loyalty, rooted in the past, is slowly giving way before colonial patriotism, reaching to the future."

He points out that the confederation of the Canadian provinces, presently followed by the building of railways to connect the territory of the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, paved the way for the growth of nationalism in Canada. In Australia, confederation came later, and nationalism was also later. After tracing this development, he says: "The conception of imperial alliance has been the natural corollary of Canadian nationalism," because of the presence of a strong and ambitious neighbour beyond an easily-crossed boundary line. Perhaps it would be fairer to say, because of the great admiration which both English and French Canadians have for the British form of government and for those institutions and national characteristics which have made Great Britain easily first among the nations.



MR. JEBB points out that at the Colonial Conference of 1902, the old idea of naval defence by the aid of colonial contributions passed away forever. In this he was a prophet as well as a shrewd observer. He remarks:

"The notion that opportunities for naval service under the British Government would suffice to give Australians or Canadians a sense of personal possession in the British navy is radically wrong. The mere fact that so futile an expedient should have been adopted seriously is a symptom of vital weakness in the theory which prompted it. . . . It appears that the Dominion shares the Australian sentiment, that naval enterprise directed to local purposes is the best method of cultivating the maritime spirit and the sense of national responsibility."

Lord Charles Beresford and other prominent Englishmen have since admitted that the "local squadron" must precede the "imperial squadron." If these younger nations are to follow the dictates of their newly-grown national consciousness they will first build for their own national defence, and later contribute to the common defence. They will satisfy their national obligations before they satisfy their imperial obligations.



IN a few days, Canada will have completed her forty-second year of nation building. The Dominion has not accomplished much, perhaps, but it has been hampered by doubt and pessimism both at home and abroad. If it failed to make an impression on the nineteenth century, it bids fair to lend a little colour to the twentieth. Among the younger nations of the world, none has brighter prospects. If Canadians are true to themselves and to the high ideals