

extent, honourable gentlemen, can we bind our heirs, our successors? To what extent can we bind future generations, compelling them to take part in all the wars which shall be determined upon by the League of Nations? To what extent can we restrict their liberty of action in their commercial relations with other countries, especially with our powerful neighbour, the United States? If Article 10 is rejected by the Congress of the United States, if they refuse to restrict their liberty of action, what shall be our situation?

Honourable gentlemen, we should not forget that we are in America and not in Europe, that geographically we are Americans and not Europeans, and that our commercial and industrial interests are American. We cannot isolate ourselves from American activities without putting in danger our prosperity, without imperilling the destiny of Canada. Our love for British institutions and our desire to continue to live under the ægis of the British Constitution should not prevent us realizing that our interests are in great part common with those of the United States. I believe I should add that the partisans of imperialism and even those who, like myself, and like the great majority of the inhabitants of this country, wish to continue to remain British subjects, will do wrong to place ourselves in a situation in which our interests would necessarily come in conflict with those of the United States and even with those of England.

However, we shall have an opportunity to discuss this question when the Treaty shall be officially placed before us, and I hope that the Senate will discuss the great problems to which it gives rise with the impartiality and the independence which they demand.

The motion for the Address was agreed to.

THE TREATY OF PEACE.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS POSTPONED.

On the notices of motion respecting the Treaty of Peace:

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Honourable gentlemen, I should like to amend the first motion that appears on the Order Paper by adding after the word "Peace" the words, "between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany." These words were omitted through inadvertence.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Does my honourable friend purpose going on with the resolution?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I am in the judgment of the House. What is my honourable friend's disposition on the question?

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: My disposition at the present moment would be to raise a point of order as to the method of procedure which my honourable friend has seen fit to adopt.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Perhaps we can consume the afternoon discussing that.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: It seems to me the procedure suggested is rather an extraordinary one, and one that this House has not hitherto given its consent to. As I understand, my honourable friend has resolutions which he proposes to move, and the Prime Minister has similar resolutions on the Order Paper in the other House which he proposes to move. It is for the Government to decide how they shall conduct the business of Parliament. It is open to them to proceed with these resolutions either in this House or in the House of Commons. After discussion and adoption by one House, the resolutions would go to the other House to be discussed. If adopted by both Houses, they would become an expression of the opinion of both Houses. But if we should proceed with this resolution in this House to-day and adopt it, and should the House of Commons proceed with the resolution and amend it in some way, it would not be an expression of the opinion of both Houses. There would be an expression of opinion by the Senate and there would be an expression of opinion by the House of Commons. It seems to me that this is an absolutely new method of procedure. I do not know whether His Honour the Speaker's attention has been drawn to it, but I think that we should very carefully consider the matter before dealing with the resolutions.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Do I understand that the honourable gentleman has in mind the adoption by the two branches of Parliament of one and the same resolution which will represent the view of Parliament? I should surmise that that was the intention of the Government, as it reads in part as follows:

Resolved, that it is expedient that Parliament do approve the Treaty of Peace.

It is not that the Commons nor that the Senate approves, but that Parliament do approve. It is simply the question of pro-