

accurate. Among other modern authorities I have consulted the New York 'Tribune' almanac, the United States government reports, the Traue and Commerce Reports of Canada and the 'British Statistical Returns.' My figures I think will be found fairly accurate. I have left off the odd units.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. May I ask my hon. friend a question before he commences his speech? On what does he base his estimate of an annual expenditure of 37 cents per head in Canada? Does he include the capital expenditure for military purposes for this year?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No the figures I took were for 1903. I used the figures as published in the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for that year. If the hon. member takes the figures of the Department of Trade and Commerce for that year and divide them by the population he will find that I am within the mark.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Including the capital expenditure?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am taking the figures published there.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I do not think it covers that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the outside, I think the largest expenditure claimed is 46 or 47 cents for this year.

However, the point I want to make in connection with it is this. I have already given the tonnage of the Canadian shipping. I now purpose submitting a brief statement of nations having merchant shipping in every instance inferior in tonnage to the Canadian shipping and I will show the expense to which each of these countries is subjected for the sustaining of its navy for the defence of its shipping.

Country.	Mercantile tonnage.	Cost of navy.
Argentine Republic.. ..	95,000	\$ 5,516,000
Austria Hungary.. ..	556,000	7,558,000
Brazil.. ..	158,000	13,408,000
Chili.. ..	113,000	4,003,000
Denmark.. ..	538,000	6,875,000
France.. ..	1,519,000	61,359,000
Italy.. ..	1,159,000	25,400,000
Mexico.. ..	18,000	2,285,000
Netherlands.. ..	612,000	6,675,000
Norway.. ..	1,632,000	1,615,000
Portugal.. ..	106,000	4,187,000
Spain.. ..	784,000	7,188,000
Sweden.. ..	690,000	3,203,000
Canada.. ..	2,000,000	.....

Canada, with about 2,000,000 tons of shipping if we include our inland shipping, with her enormous shipping ranking fourth or fifth of the nations of the world, pays not one dollar. These are figures which I am sure will rather surprise the House and which will rather make those who talk very glibly around the country about sever-

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

ing the last ties that bind us to the empire and setting up our own flag as an independent nation, hesitate before they launch the great project of cutting the last tie that holds us to Britain and setting up our own establishment.

Canada's trade as compared with that of Great Britain last year stood in the proportion of about one to ten, her shipping about one to seven and her population about one to eight. Great Britain pays an enormous sum for the maintenance of her navy, I think \$150,000,000. Canada profits by the protection afforded her throughout the world by that navy, yet she contributes not one dollar to its support. As has been aptly stated, Britain's fleet guards Canada's trade, Britain's army protects us throughout the length and breadth of the world. We profit by the fact that Britain has guaranteed our loans in the past and so saved the people of our country in straight dollars and cents large sums of interest money. Britain has given Canada vast military properties, forts and other public properties of the empire which Canada now holds. Britain conducts Canada's consular services and to it all we contribute one half the cost of maintenance of a little garrison at Esquimalt, and that is the sum total of Canada's contribution to the great imperial concern. Yet hon. gentlemen will hesitate as to whether we should allow ourselves to be considered as part and parcel of the great empire. Let us take another aspect of the case. Various plans have been proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite for the defence of Canada. The Minister of the Interior in a very able speech delivered in this city, with much of which I heartily agree, said that it was his ambition to see a military rifle in the hands of every man in Canada with ammunition for practice and ranges where this practice might be carried out. This was the statement of the Minister of the Interior, one of the most progressive young members of parliament, one of the most progressive men in many respects in Canada, the Napoleon of the government. I find the Prime Minister himself—I do not know whether it was in a moment of weakness—on a very recent occasion when it was at all events congenial to take this line, stated that he wished to see volunteer companies, not rifle companies merely but volunteer companies in every village, town, city and community in Canada. I find too, that the member for Labelle, speaking in this House has also endorsed similar views to those held by the Prime Minister. These are the views held by these gentlemen. Now, Sir, on the other hand, I find the Toronto 'Globe' with another line of defence.

The 'Globe' has announced its defence policy. For land defence we will depend upon the kindness of our good neighbour, Uncle Sam. For maritime defence we already shelter behind the skirts of Great Britain. This