

righteous war than Great Britain would to repel the invader. Douglas Jerrold says:

We love peace as we abhor pusillanimity, but not peace at any price. There is a peace more destructive of the manhood of living man, than war is destructive of his material body. Chains are worse than bayonets.

In regard to some of the arguments that have been advanced as to our duty to build up our material welfare, Shakespeare is my authority for saying that 'plenty and peace breed cowards'.

Now, Sir, I may be asked, why is this naval question in issue at the present time? The German ambassador to the peace conference at the Hague has published recently a curious book, in which he declares that 'the growth of the peace movement involves a national peril'. According to Baron Von Stengel, human progress has more often been the result of war than of peace. 'Athens and Rome', he writes, in his striking chapter on 'the significance of war for the development of humanity'.

Not only in spite of, but just because of their many wars, rose to the zenith of civilization. Great states like Germany and Italy are welded into nationalities only through blood and iron. Storm purifies the air and destroys the frail trees, leaving the sturdy oaks standing. War is the test of a nation's political, physical and intellectual worth. The state in which there is much that is rotten may vegetate for a while in peace, but in war its weakness is revealed. Germany's preparations for war have not resulted in economic disaster, but in unexampled economic expansion—unquestionably because of our demonstrated superiority over France. It is better to spend money on battleships and armaments than luxury, motormanias and other sensual living.

Germany to-day has upwards of 4,000,000 men that she can turn into the field at an hour's notice. She has undoubtedly the command of the land, and she aspires to the control of the sea. It is a well known fact that for ages she has aspired, and that recently, she has still more aspired, to the control of Holland and Belgium. She wishes, as she showed by her attitude at the time of the South African war, to disrupt the British empire and obtain control of the British colonies. In this connection I do not know that I can do better than quote from an address made by the hon. member for the Yukon last year, to convince this House that that is the object of Germany. In a speech in this House, reported in 'Hansard' of last session, at page 3526, that hon. gentleman said:

I believe the object in the creation of the German navy is to obtain an outlet of that kind, but I am satisfied that that aim could be best obtained by negotiations with other nations

Where can Germany get the outlet? Can my hon. friend from the Yukon point to any area under the broad canopy of heaven where Germany can get colonies that are not already occupied. Taking him at his word, Germany's aim is to obtain colonies for her trade, and she can obtain these only in one way. They cannot be obtained by peace negotiations. The way Germany negotiates is at the point of the bayonet and the end of the rifle. As Britain holds 25 per cent of the land of the globe and 90 per cent of the colonial territory of the globe, the only way in which Germany can obtain colonies is by taking them from Great Britain. And, we have the spectacle of this great empire, the champion of liberty in every part of the globe, threatened by a nation created by herself the century before the last.

Now, I want to touch upon a point about which this House has heard from me before. At the time of the American colonies Benjamin Franklin and other American statesmen proposed the confederation of the British empire. That proposition was not taken up. In the old days French Canadian gentlemen from the province of Quebec proposed that the colonies should be given representation in the British parliament. Gentlemen from upper Canada many years ago proposed the same thing, and the redoubtable Joseph Howe, in letters and speeches, proposed a federation of the British empire, under which the colonies would have a voice and a vote in the government of the empire and be prepared to take their fair share in its defence. These men were right in assuming that in return for the privileges conferred upon us, we should take our share of the risks and dangers to which the empire may be exposed. I am satisfied that the solution of the problem is easy. A man with the genius of Cromwell or William Pitt or William III. could federate the empire in a year. I believe that if Chamberlain or Milner, or Balfour, or either of the Greys, or Mr. Amery, one of the greatest students of imperial questions, were given the opportunity, any of these men could federate the British empire in six months; and, although I have not the honour of the acquaintance of Mr. Asquith or Mr. Lloyd-George, I believe that either of these gentlemen if he had a heart and soul as broad as his ability, could do the same. The history of colonial and imperial wars proves that colonial assistance which was declared by some of the great men of Canada as monstrous, as contrary to responsible government, as impossible, was supplied in two weeks' time when the emergency arose. So let the statesmen of to-day not hesitate about the confederation of the empire, which would solve every question that might arise in connection