

domestic affairs, we are engaged in building another National Transcontinental railway, we are improving our waterways, we are developing our resources, and they think that thus they are discharging their full obligation in the way of national defence. Let me ask, what spirit it is that dominates us in the developing of our own resources? Surely we are doing this solely and wholly for our own advancement and for the prosperity and progress of our own people. If England has incidentally benefited by reason of Canada's development, are we, because of that, to calmly fold our arms and congratulate ourselves on having discharged our full obligation in the way of naval defence? When Canada built the Canadian Pacific railway which joined our various provinces into one mighty nation, true we incidentally provided a new highway between Great Britain, Australasia, China and Japan, but who will claim that any imperial sentiment inspired us in the construction of that railroad? Who will seriously contend that such an idea entered into our calculations at all? If Canada spends her millions of dollars for the purpose of developing her resources, for the purpose of making this an attractive field for immigration and increasing the prosperity of our people, does not that very fact entail on us an additional obligation, for surely a country that is worth developing, is worth defending? The question is: What are the best means of defence? Now, in connection with this question, probably one of the greatest obstacles to overcome is the apathy of the people consequent on a feeling of false security. We have been so prone for years past to look upon the British fleet as being invincible that we possibly have not taken into consideration the great changes that have taken place in recent years in the increased armaments of other countries. Another reason for the apathy of the people is to be found in the sentiment of a large proportion of them against what is called militarism. But, Sir, so long as a hostile country starts out with the avowed object of overcoming the British fleet, which at the present time is our sole and only guarantee of peace and prosperity, much as we may deplore large expenditure for purposes of defence, no monetary considerations should be permitted to prevent us from a continuance of that means of defence which will insure to us that peace and prosperity which is so essential to our national existence. In union there is strength, and this is just as true in connection with naval matters as it is in connection with other matters, and, with a large, powerful, central empire's fleet not merely for the purposes of local defence, not merely for the purpose of defending Canada, Australia and New Zealand, but to be stationed at the most vulnerable points

in time of war, that in my opinion is the best means for the security and permanent defence of the empire as a whole. I have referred to the state of public feeling in Germany with regard to England, and I desire to draw attention to a few extracts which have not as yet been quoted to the House—and it is very difficult to get extracts that have not been cited up to the present—in order to show the state of public feeling in Germany against England, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary by the Prime Minister and others on that side of the House. Professor Hans Dilbrück, lecturer on history in the University of Berlin, writing to that well-known periodical, the 'North American Review,' said:

A nation as well as an individual must seemingly either love or hate. If the multitude had no enemy to be the object of its hatred it would take no part in foreign politics at all. So the German nation, which once celebrated with delight, the memory of the 'belle alliance of Blucher and Wellington at Waterloo,' has now riveted its hate against England.

I am sorry the right hon. the First Minister is not here, because he referred to this. Notwithstanding these people were allies in the past, notwithstanding that they fought together at Waterloo, here we have a German professor stating that the German people to-day are actuated with hatred against the English race. What object would this gentleman have in misrepresenting the state of public feeling in his own country? But he is not the only authority. Another German professor writing to Sydney Whitman, the well known English authority on German affairs—I refer to Professor Theodore Mommsen, of the university of Berlin—regarding the German attitude, said:

The hate against your countrymen has reached fearful, and I must add, unjust dimensions.

Would these gentlemen write in such a strain unless they had good ground? Later still, Professor Treitsche, the great German historian—and I wish to call the attention of some of the Liberal members who spoke last year on the resolution, to this particular authority:

If our empire has the courage to follow an independent colonial policy with determination a collision of our interests and those of England are unavoidable.

An hon. gentleman who spoke in this House last session said he knew perfectly well that the enlargement of the German fleet was destined for colonization purposes. But where are they going to get those colonies, and how are they going to get them? By peaceful means? Not according to this German authority, who says they cannot