

has not been brought up for the purpose of forming a party policy, because it is useless now; it has been brought up for some other object, and I wish some hon. gentleman opposite would relieve me from the suspicion that it has been introduced at this time (when we are endeavoring to settle existing international disputes) for the purpose of damaging the best interests of the people of this country.

But we can at any time withdraw from continental union if it works unfavorably. That is just what they are after. Mr. Speaker, they want to get an international union with the United States, and those countries that exist in the United States, both agricultural and manufacturing, would pour down their surplus upon us here for the purpose of extinguishing every member of life in every industry in this country. That is soon as they succeeded in extinguishing these, then the whole of the capital of this country would be transferred to the United States, and when they had all our artisans also on the other side of the line, they would say, "We want your treaty no longer," and might be made right in this case, as I have already said. Then in what position would we be placed? It would cost us to try the experiment—and it would be only an experiment—what? It would cost us about three hundred thousand artisans. What do these hundred thousand artisans mean to this country? Each one of these artisans and his family are worth to Canada at least \$1,000, and you can multiply three hundred thousand by one thousand dollars and find the cost. We would lose that to next with. We would also lose two hundred or two hundred and fifty millions of capital now invested in manufactures. And what would we lose besides? We would lose the respect of every right thinking man not only in this country, and in Great Britain, but every of honest people and right thinking man in the United States, who would look upon us with scorn and contempt. That is the situation in which hon. gentlemen opposite desire to place Canada. I repeat that this position

is not a party policy, but a policy of international union.

But we can at any time withdraw from continental union if it works unfavorably. That is just what they are after. Mr. Speaker, they want to get an international union with the United States, and those countries that exist in the United States, both agricultural and manufacturing, would pour down their surplus upon us here for the purpose of extinguishing every member of life in every industry in this country. That is soon as they succeeded in extinguishing these, then the whole of the capital of this country would be transferred to the United States, and when they had all our artisans also on the other side of the line, they would say, "We want your treaty no longer," and might be made right in this case, as I have already said. Then in what position would we be placed? It would cost us to try the experiment—and it would be only an experiment—what? It would cost us about three hundred thousand artisans. What do these hundred thousand artisans mean to this country? Each one of these artisans and his family are worth to Canada at least \$1,000, and you can multiply three hundred thousand by one thousand dollars and find the cost. We would lose that to next with. We would also lose two hundred or two hundred and fifty millions of capital now invested in manufactures. And what would we lose besides? We would lose the respect of every right thinking man not only in this country, and in Great Britain, but every of honest people and right thinking man in the United States, who would look upon us with scorn and contempt. That is the situation in which hon. gentlemen opposite desire to place Canada. I repeat that this position