

dinary sense in which it is used in English literature; and if the hon. gentleman was a little more conversant with English literature, he would see there is nothing offensive in the term in the sense in which I used it.

Mr. SPEAKER. My ruling is that it is a figure of speech.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Even if you had told me I was out of order—

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman does not use the expression in an offensive way.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Certainly not.

Mr. TALBOT. Then it is an after dinner expression.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Now let me come to the continental aspect of this great question. There are two systems of government on this continent to-day; there is the American system and there is the Canadian or British system. What is the difference between them, and where are we likely to land if the Canadian system should disappear? The British system of government as exemplified in the old land, and more or less exemplified in Canada, is an unlimited system of government. Certainly in the old country they can do anything the people desire, they can carry out any view that the people may hold. Let me compare that system with the United States system. In the United States the government is limited in every way and problems that arise there cannot be dealt with. Under the British system they can be dealt with, and are being dealt with, as we see to-day where great social and economical questions are being handled and carried out. In the United States the dominant idea is the exploitation of the resources of the country, the exploitation of its natural resources by the great interests. In England and in Canada more attention is paid to social and economic conditions; but in the United States everybody is devoting his time and energy to the exploitation of the natural resources of the country, and of the public interests by the great corporations. As a consequence of this condition of things, affairs have come to a rather bad mess in the United States, and now we find that the Senate of the United States has gradually absorbed most of the powers of government. Even the integrity of the courts has been questioned, and the control of the legislatures has passed into the hands, to some extent, of the interests. We see now a great magazine movement in the United States, the object of which is to restore the old time conditions and to get them into better shape. They point out that a marvellous change

Mr. MACLEAN (South York).

has come about in the last 20 or 25 years, and that the old democracy which existed in that country from the inception of the union down to the period of the great civil war, has disappeared. In former days there was a political equality, one man's vote and influence were as good as another's. Now all that has disappeared. The great interests have control of the legislatures; they have control of the courts, and to such an extent, that the old democratic equality of political power as between individuals no longer obtains, but all power is centred in the great interests, or in what are called the political machines. That is a thing to be deplored. But there is worse than that. There is no longer any democracy of opportunity in the United States, no longer is there any democracy of wealth, all that has disappeared. In the old days one man's wealth was almost equal to another's, but to-day there is an enormous concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. The control of a great many institutions dealing with the savings of the people has absolutely passed to Wall street, the control of the savings of the people vested in insurance companies has passed to Wall street. To-day things are so bad that the people are almost on the verge of revolution. And yet, Sir, at the very time when this great political upheaval is in sight, we propose to enter into closer relations with the people of the United States, and to put the control of our tariff into their hands. When the inevitable disorder and revolution come about, they will have control of our tariff, and where will we be? We will be dealing with a nation whose record shows them to be not over careful or over scrupulous in the way they handle questions of that kind. They would say: The best way to put down a revolution at home is to extend the American flag all over the continent. That is really the proposal that we are dealing with to-day; they wish to divert public attention from domestic troubles, and to turn it upon this question of trade relations with Canada.

In the past we know that they were not friendly to us. The people of the United States drove out the United Empire Loyalists, who made this country. They invaded this country more than once, they allowed the Fenians to invade this country, and the dream of every American statesman to-day is the unification of the continent. They have the plan all laid out for taking over Mexico any day, but they say that with Mexico in its present condition the people are too yellow for them and they propose to counterbalance them with the white people of Canada and bring the two countries in together. Will anybody deny that such a feeling is existing over there? I have read it time and again. The republican party of the United States have