

as the price of her alliance. We know also that when the Navy Bill was being discussed and the British government tried to come to an accommodation with Germany, the Kaiser and his ministers would not negotiate. By way of reply to Great Britain's overtures looking to a scaling down of armaments, Germany enlarged her naval and military appropriations. These appropriations still increase. For 1910 they are \$312,000,000, or \$43,000,000 more than last year. The outlay on the navy alone for next year will be \$111,000,000, by far the largest in the country's history. The Germany government stands pledged to a policy, by Act of parliament, to add four Dreadnoughts a year up to 1912. That is the adopted policy of the nation.

I wish to refer now to a statement made by the gentleman who represents the 'Times' in Paris. I am told that he is a gentleman of the highest standing and one who would not make a statement which he did not believe to be correct. He says:

Politicians observe that whenever the question is raised of reducing armaments, whether on land or at sea, and whether the initiative comes from the Tzar of Russia, or from the British Prime Minister, Germany is always the first to refuse, with a shrug of the shoulders, and a loud German laugh.

The doctrine of English naval supremacy is one that William the Second is determined to overthrow. It has been said, and I have heard it stated, that Germany could not afford to build these vessels, that she could not afford to go to the enormously increased expense. I have a statement here made by her Finance Minister. He says that the expenditure on the army and navy per head in Germany is 18.95 marks and in Great Britain 29.23 marks. That means that Great Britain's army and navy expenditure is almost 60 per cent larger than Germany's. Germany's military and naval burden is carried by a larger number of people. The vastness of her unexercised resources may be seen from the fact that Professor Conrad tells us she could raise an additional £50,000,000 per year by increasing only her indirect taxation to Great Britain's level, leaving her more direct taxation unchanged. It is only necessary to refer to this financial statement to show that the position of Great Britain is serious. Her taxation is the heaviest in the world. Reference has been made by the hon. gentleman who has spoken to the position of Germany's great army and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) told us the other day of the Kiel canal that he saw when he was in Germany last year. The Kiel canal is 60 miles long. That canal is being enlarged so as to accommodate the largest battleships. An enormous amount of money is to be spent so that she can

have communication between the North Sea and the Baltic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in considering the causes which led to the rise and fall of nations, we find that the first requisite to ensure national greatness is the national sentiment, that is, a patriotic feeling in the individual, and a general confidence in the future of the state. This spirit naturally exhibits itself in military powers, in the determination of placing country first, in being willing to undergo hardship, privation and want, and even to lay down life on behalf of the nation. There is no record in history of any nation obliterating itself and giving up its nationality for the sake of making a few cents a dozen on its eggs or a few cents a bushel on its grain. The fallacy that peace and progress are synonymous, that war is retrograde, has lately been in vogue. This doctrine is peculiar to a section of the British race, but it has found few followers in any other great nation. We find around us nations armed to the teeth, watching an opportunity for dividing among themselves this, our empire, and it is the preacher of this galling, senseless doctrine that may yet open the door for them. Wherever civilization has found its way, there it has been carried by the sword, and nurtured by Christianity. Every nation that has risen, has carved its way up by the sword, and retained its position only by a preparedness with force of arms. When once its weapons have been laid aside, then has been the signal for decadence. Ruskin puts it as follows:

We talk of peace and learning, and of peace and plenty and of peace and civilization, but I find that they were not the words which the muse of history coupled together:

That on her lips the words were: 'Peace and sensuality, peace and selfishness, peace and death.' I find in brief that all great nations learned their truth and word and strength of thought, in war; that they flourished in war and wasted by peace.

Trained by war and betrayed by peace. In a word, that they were born in war and expired in peace. The pages of history show the following nations have expired in peace: Portugal, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Greece. Japan, a nation born yesterday, she could to-day, by force of arms, encompass the overthrow of the whole five combined.

Thus were these nations betrayed, standing as beacons to guide us, the proud possessor of an empire, an empire entering upon a period of peace adoration which is foreign to the clime of military races. Other nations have recognized that the greatest evil, attendant upon civilization, is the abhorrence of war, and they have, in time, taken the steps necessary to counteract the dislike for fighting, by getting ready to fight. Germany, through her