

hon. friend that if these proposals of his mean anything, in my judgment, they mean, in the end that commercial union for which he fought in 1891, and concerning which a man who was his leader for some years, and whom he followed in this House, and in this country, made a memorable declaration over his signature, in a letter published immediately after the election of 1891. Hon. Edward Blake, to whom I refer, had no doubt that commercial union would lead to, would end in the political absorption of Canada into the United States which the right hon. gentleman says is not a danger to-day. My right hon. friend touched with a very light hand some very notable utterances which have been made in the Congress of the United States. I will not deal with the press comment in the United States; I have seen a great deal of it. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is perfectly right when he says that press opinion in the United States in very many influential quarters is supporting these proposals, not upon economic considerations, but for the reason that they will undoubtedly lead to the political absorption of this country into the United States; and in that they are of course simply following the line which Mr. Blake took in 1891 when he said that commercial union meant in the end political union. The Prime Minister was inclined to refer in a somewhat jocular way to the utterances of Mr. Champ Clark in the House of Representatives of the United States. There was a very mysterious silence about those utterances in a certain part of the press of the United States immediately after they had been made. As far as one could judge, it was an inspired silence. I find that on the day following those utterances there were press despatches in nearly all the newspapers of Canada, which were designed to lead the people of this country to suppose that Mr. Champ Clark had made those utterances in a jocular way. I took the very first opportunity of examining the 'Congressional Record' to ascertain if possible from the context whether those utterances were serious or jocular, and I will read them to this House from the 'Congressional Record,' with a portion of the context, and hon. gentlemen can judge for themselves whether they were serious or not. It is perfectly true that this gentleman occupies a very important place in the United States at the present time. He is the leader of the Democratic party in the House of Representatives, and it is believed that he will be the Speaker of that House in the new Congress. The vote upon this reciprocity agreement divided the Republican party. A majority of the Republican party voted against it—if I remember rightly, 87 voted against it, and 78 for it. Mr. Clark made his

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

appeal to the Democratic party, with the result that 142 members of that party besides himself voted for the agreement, and I think only five Democrats voted against it. So that the appeal that carried the Democratic party in the United States House of Representatives to vote for the agreement was the appeal contained in the speech of Mr. Champ Clark. What was that appeal? I will read what Mr. Champ Clark said, as reported at page 2623 of the 'Congressional Record' of the 14th of February, 1911:

The chief thing that this country needs in its business is a wider market, and I am in favour of this reciprocity Bill because it gives wider markets to American products. That will be one great point gained. Considered as a whole, our exports are large, but our per capita exports are smaller than those of any other great commercial nation on earth, which is not a healthy condition.

You will observe that there is no humour thus far; everything is matter of fact and plain and serious. He continues:

As much as any other living man I desire to see them increased. Therefore I am for this Bill, because it will increase our exports. I am in favour of this Bill because it establishes closer trade relations with one of our nearest neighbours, and the closer trade relations you have with your neighbours the better off you are.

No humour—nothing of a jocular character, thus far.

When Thomas Jefferson delivered his first inaugural on the 4th day of March, 1801, he enunciated the principles upon which this government should be conducted, and one of the principles was: 'Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.'

No humour there, and nothing of a jocular nature thus far; and, by the way, the last clause of that sentence in particular would be a very good motto for Canada at the present time. He continues:

That has been the mainspring of our policy ever since, or should have been. We have spent or will spend somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$500,000,000 to build the Panama canal. Therefore I am in favour of the reciprocity treaty to promote our trade relations. That is what we spent that money for. We are not spending that vast sum because we are altruists but as a business matter.

I do not observe anything of a jocular or humorous character in Mr. Clark's remarks up to this point. Then he continues:

I am for it, because I hope to see the day the American flag will float over every square foot of the British North America possessions clear to the north pole.

I do not observe anything which would lead me to believe that that remark was