

refused to entertain a proposal to extend their states farther until a Canadian counter-balance of white people is brought about. Look at the construction of the Panama canal. What is the object of that but the continentalization of the whole of America. They have gradually dipped their hands into the affairs of every little republic in Central America. Morgan, the other day, financed Honduras for the purpose of making it easy to secure American control of the Panama canal. They are building that canal and they are going to dominate the whole of Central America. They took over the Panama belt, not by any right, but by an Act of acquisition, and roughshod acquisition at that. They are ready to take over Mexico, but they want Canada as an offset. Continentalism is the dream of every American. I do not blame them at all for having such dreams, but I do blame my fellow-countrymen who will aid and abet such dreams by setting down to make a tariff with them to the disadvantage of Canada, the result of which will be that we shall have to go to Washington to make the future tariffs of this country.

Mr. DEVLIN. Was that sentiment existing in the States in 1894?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I cannot say what were the sentiments in 1894; I say that the sentiment that exists to-day is continentalism.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman explain why, in this House, in 1894, Sir John Thompson, then Prime Minister of Canada, made use of these words:

The hon. gentleman says we could have a greater trade than that by throwing down the tariff wall. He goes on the old fallacy, which we have had put forward in this country for ten years, that all we have to do is to pass a statute and have reciprocity with the United States. By all means, if the regulation of the trade with a foreign country is in the hands of this parliament, let us pass a statute and have reciprocity right away.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Reciprocity brought about by the independent action of each House, or rather a tariff made by each House that gives us free trade no one can blame because then each party could act absolutely in its own interest. If such a tariff resulted in promoting trade I could not say anything against it, because it might be a benefit to this country, but to sit down surreptitiously, not openly, and make a tariff without consulting the Canadian people, is a crime against this country, and the country will hold every man responsible who attempts to do it. The tendency of this proposition is towards annexation. The hope of the world is the domination and success of the British system of politics, that system

of government which we have inherited from the old land. There is more thought of humanity and progress in the British association of free states like the mother country, Canada and Australia, than in anything else. There is no hope for humanity in the domination of the American republic over the whole of this continent. They are not taking up any of the great questions of to-day. They are not fighting the battles of humanity, they are not fighting the battle of the heathen or the oppressed in the distant continents of Africa or Asia. The hope of humanity in the British system, and one of the bulwarks of the British system is the maintenance of Canadian nationality on the northern half of this continent. There is danger of our Canadian nationality being injured by appeals being made to the people based on their pocket rather than on their nationality, appeals where there is no deliberation, where there is no amendment and no compromise. I say as a Canadian, what I said in opening my speech here to-day, that I have little fear of annexation resulting as some people think. But there is one section of this community that I wish to make an appeal to to-day. Perhaps I will not be credited with much earnestness in making the suggestion, but I do make the suggestion to my fellow-countrymen who live in the province of Quebec, who are of the French race and who value above all the autonomy which they have to-day. I say that anything that tends in the direction of annexation, or if annexation should ever come as the result of these proposals, it means good-bye to the people of Quebec with regard to the autonomy that they have to-day. It will be wiped out like a flash in the night.

Mr. TALBOT. We thank you for the advice.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I knew I would meet that statement from some one, but I say to the people of Quebec that they had better pause when an organic proposal of that kind is being made and not allow themselves to be led into the support of such a proposal because it means the end of their autonomy and any other autonomy within the limits of Canada will disappear later on. To-day is the day to put in a protest, and if the people of Quebec love their institutions, their language and their rights, as I believe they do, they will see to it—and this is to be my amendment later on.

Mr. DEVLIN. Why does the hon. gentleman appeal to Quebec?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have the right, I hope. They are my fellow-countrymen, as much as you are, and if the opportunity is presented to me—