

ous, a stout-hearted, a moral and a righteous people, we shall always be prepared to defend ourselves. It is this fitness to win that is the determining factor. You may get all the ships you want and all the guns, but you must have the men behind them to accomplish much.

Sir James MacIntosh has pointed out the change that has taken place in conditions of this kind since men emerged from a state of savagery and a state of despotism into the free institutions of to-day. He points out that in a despotic country it is necessary to have an army as a seminary of martial spirit, in order to prevent the despot sinking into languor and laziness; in order to stir up the best impulses and faculties of the savage, it is essential that he should be stimulated at times by the frenzy of war; but in this greatest of free communities, the British empire, we need no such stimulants as that. We have, in the habits and modes of our life, that which readily lends itself to the system and genius of war. We have a free people; the point of honour with our nation is not its army, not its navy, but liberty, and if you preserve this liberty throughout the empire, if you preserve the freedom of the individual and of the component parts of this empire, there will be never lacking, either in Canada or any other of the Dominions of Britain, a spirit that will defend that particular portion and assist to the greatest possible extent in the defence of the whole. The people of Great Britain have never been a people of soldiers, no occasion has arisen on which they have not shown themselves a nation of warriors. I believe the same thing will be true of Canada, that we have to-day in Canada enterprises that require identically the same skill, as much courage and persistence, as are engaged in the task of war. You have the pioneering population engaged in operations as serious and dangerous as any of those ever taken part in by warriors; you have our whole railway system, which requires as much genius in organizing and operating as are required in the organization and operation of a large army. And so, in all the diverse operations and business of civilized life, you find that which stimulates every faculty of the mind, which stimulates all the best qualities in men and prepares them when there is any danger, to defend themselves without having to go through preliminary drills in awkward squads. What we need is the nucleus of military and naval defence. So far as this Bill carries that out, I am heartily in favour of it. So long as it is only the legitimate and just provision for the defence of this country and contains no threat of aggression on any other nation unless we are attacked, I am in favour of it, and I mistake the spirit of my country-

Mr. CONGDON.

men if they have not sufficient faith in our genius, to undertake the construction of all the instruments necessary for our defence without sending their money to Great Britain or any other country to be expended for that purpose.

I believe that such a policy is in the interests of this country and of the empire and therefore I shall have great pleasure in voting for the original resolution before the House.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (Victoria-Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has listened with a great deal of interest to the very magnificent essay, partly on philosophy, partly on metaphysics, with a little touch of religion in it some very badly quoted history, a eulogy of the First Minister, a eulogy of the Nova Scotia Steel Works and the natural resources of our country, an apology for every enemy Britain has had and a condemnation of everything that has gone to make up Britain's greatness in days gone by. We have listened to the hon. gentleman along this line yesterday afternoon and to-day, and I am sure he has contributed very little to the matter before the House, the Naval Bill which the government has brought down and the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). According to this luminary on military and naval matters, the opinions of Lord Roberts, Lord Kitchener, Lord Wolseley, Lord Charles Beresford, Hon. Mr. Asquith, leader of the Liberal government, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Haldane, every prominent statesman of to-day—and they are not old men because the Asquith government boasts of being young men—are of no value. These gentlemen are in their dotage, they are old women, to use his own expression, and they know not whereof they speak in warning Britain whereof they know, that Britain is in danger from the sea power as she is from the military power of the German empire. Dreamers are always nice gentlemen to meet but very dangerous men. Robespierre in France was one of the most beautiful types of intellect that could be found in the whole of that magnificent empire. He would weep at seeing any of the minor animals in trouble, a chicken losing its head caused him to shed tears, and yet Robespierre was the man of all others who drenched France in blood when he got the authority. Dreamers are dangerous men, Sir. My good friend has referred in contemptuous terms to the Duke of Wellington, to Lord Beaconsfield, to Charles Napier, and to numbers of other gentlemen whose names I was unable to catch as he uttered them. He has spoken of the English to-day as panic mongers, and has said that these agitations were gotten up in music halls, by half-pay officers, and that there was no falsehood that has not been