

Canada ranks ninth amongst these nations in tonnage and shipping. She ranks last in expenditure for defensive purposes on her army and navy. She ranks eleventh in population and ninth in trade. A brief comparison: Canada has a shipping tonnage of 683,000 tons; the Netherlands has a tonnage of 687,000 tons. Canada spends for defence \$2,524,000; the Netherlands spends for defence \$16,176,000. Canada has a population of 5,371,000; the Netherlands has a population of 5,263,000. Then, we find that Canada pays not much over one-eighth of what the people of the Netherlands pay for defensive purposes. Then, let us take Chili, which is a South American republic, entirely out of the range of war. Chili has 108,000 tons of shipping, an expenditure for war purposes of \$8,695,000, and a population of 3,050,000. Argentina has a tonnage of 188,000, a war payment of \$14,516,000, and a population of 4,794,000. Denmark has a tonnage of 597,000, an expenditure of \$9,638,000 for war purposes, a population of 2,464,000, and a total trade of \$218,000,000. Comparisons with all these nations redound to the disadvantage of our own country, and they show that we are sitting here in this Dominion supinely letting the British taxpayer foot our bills.

The figures of Canada and United States tonnage do not include the wooden vessels on the great lakes, nor do the British figures include the small coasting vessels; Australasia includes New Zealand.

Among all these nations Canada alone spends nothing for naval purposes. If Canada were independent, she must keep pace with the United States; we would have to do our share or the

UNITED STATES WOULD NOT PROTECT US.

Either, we would become annexed to that country or we would have to undertake an enormous immediate expenditure for defence. The question may properly be asked: Why should we do anything that would involve a great expenditure for such a small concern when we can get along much better at a small expense for a great concern?

The next proposition is that we should

REMAIN UNDER THE BRITISH FLAG,

but control our own army and navy. This is not open to discussion. It is a humiliating position for a great people. I could easily show the weakness of such a position as regards defence purposes, as regards the upbuilding of a nation, and as regards fair play and the adjustment of the cost.

The proposition to remain under the British flag while at the same time contributing to imperial defence may pass without comment, because *that principle of taxation, direct or indirect, without representation would not commend itself to Canadians.* There, therefore, only remains the one proposition of a

FULL PARTNERSHIP UNION.

There are a few objections occasionally raised to this idea, but their refutation is self evident and I need not trouble the House with any remarks on that point.

In favour of a full partnership union we have the tendency during many years towards union and amalgamation in our national, our geographical, our political and our commercial life.

The old fear that you cannot successfully manage large concerns, disappears in the light of history.

When the Republic of the United States was proclaimed, it was declared that it could not last for any time; so with the union of Great Britain and Ireland, and so with all the federations which have become successful in history; they have all dissipated the fears entertained at their birth.

History shows that combinations of great peoples have tended to the advancement of humanity. In the British Isles the combination of the great races has made that country what she is to-day.

I need not point out to the House that this movement which I propose, would bring peace and prosperity to the empire and to the whole world as well.

It would do away with the necessity for the great expenditures now made by different nations on their armies and navies.

In our own country we have a great many of our young men familiar with the English and German languages, the English and French languages, the English and Russian languages, and these young men would take their places in filling the commercial agencies and consular agencies and ambassadorial positions in various parts of the world.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Gaelic.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They say Gaelic was the language of the Garden of Eden as it is the language of the superior regions, but I do not know to what country we could