

when England is bearing the burden of taxation resulting from the war. We should be helping to carry the burden of that magnificent fleet which protects our shores both in times of war and in times of peace.

If we are a nation, ready made we must have a fleet. If we have attained this wonderful status; if we are independent, although we have sent half a million people to the United States to look for jobs, then we must have a fleet. Are we to wait until some foreign fleet sails up the St. Lawrence and blows up some of our great buildings? Under this new status, are we to issue Canadian passports instead of accepting British passports? I have never had an opportunity of going to the old country, but I know that if I ever do go I will want a British passport; I will not want a scrap of paper called a Canadian passport under our new autonomy and status as an independent nation under separatism.

In this connection I would like to quote an article which appeared in the *Toronto Saturday Night* a short time ago:

Saturday Night is occasionally accused of being too British in its sympathies by those "little Canadians" who secretly or openly advocate anything which may assist the severance of the British connection. This journal believes that those who advocate this course are not fully cognizant of the extent and importance of the benefits that Canada derives from its membership in the British Commonwealth.

The truth is that if, as we are told, it is more blessed to give than to receive, Great Britain has a better claim than Canada to a place in the Heavenly Kingdom. British taxpayers are now, and have been for many years, annually providing immense sums of money that would have to be raised here in Canada if British support were withdrawn. Consider, for example, the matter of naval defence. This is surely as relatively important to Canada with its Pacific coast just across the street, as it were, from the teeming millions of China and Japan, whose most urgent need is room for expansion, as it is to Great Britain herself. Canada would not survive many decades without adequate protection. Furthermore, sea-power is obviously needed to protect Canada's ever-growing overseas trade.

And who now pays the cost of this protection? Figures published by the Federation of British Industries show that the estimated expenditure by Great Britain on naval defence of the Empire, during the fiscal year 1925-26, was approximately \$302,500,000, by Canada \$1,500,000, by Australia \$19,605,725, plus a special appropriation of \$5,000,000, by New Zealand \$2,691,625, and by South Africa \$699,465. The payment per capita of population in Great Britain was approximately \$6.69, in Canada 16 cents, in Australia \$3.16, in New Zealand \$1.92, and in South Africa 42 cents. Thus it is obvious that the overwhelming proportion of the cost of the naval defence of the British Commonwealths is borne by Great Britain.

The total for Great Britain and northern Ireland was \$2,730,000,000, with a per capita

[Mr. Church.]

cost of \$61.98; for Canada \$145,000,000, per capita \$16.72; for Australia \$165,000,000, per capita \$30.42; for South Africa \$15,000,000, per capita \$9.82; and for New Zealand \$30,000,000, per capita \$25.42. These figures clearly show the striking disproportion between the burdens borne by the British and dominions taxpayers.

In many respects other than national defence Canada benefits enormously by her partnership in the empire. For example, she is given the full use of Britain's world-wide diplomatic and consular facilities and pays therefor not one penny. The conception that many Canadians have of Great Britain as a tottering old lady depending for support on her stalwart sons is, of course, very far removed from actuality. Without the dominions of India, Great Britain would still be one of the world's mightiest powers, with dominion over 3,800,000 square miles and one hundred millions of people. J. L. Garvin, editor of the *London Observer*, wrote recently in this connection:

It is hard, and sometimes seems hopeless, to make the self-governing dominions understand that Great Britain, though never dreaming of keeping any kind of restrictions upon them in its own interest, is a mighty nation on its own basis; so that if—which heaven forbid—every single self-governing dominion were to secede to-morrow, Great Britain's remaining dependencies and protectorates would still cover millions of square miles, still constituting in productive area the largest and best and most valuable colonial system in the world.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we are still prepared, under this policy, to sponge on the mother country, maritime freedom instead of taking a leaf out of the books of Australia and New Zealand at the last Imperial conference and doing something on a worthy scale in the interest of the empire and for maritime freedom.

There is a subject on which I should like to get some information from the government. I have noticed in the press within the last few days a despatch from Detroit and Washington that some ten thousand Canadians who live in Windsor and now working in Detroit are running the risk of losing their jobs in Detroit on January 1st and being deprived of their bread and butter. I think the government should look into this matter. Under this new doctrine of separatism, under this new brilliant status idea originated by the present government, Canada is going to resemble one of the many Latin republics of South America, and as a consequence although the city of Ottawa is known to-day as "the Washington of the North", this country will be stigmatized now as "the Mexico of the North". We may talk in vain about any solution of the problem of the diversion of water by Chicago. Under separatism we may say good bye to any hope of getting anywhere in the settlement of this question. In the treaty made between Great Britain and United States, Canada has not