

proposal and the people of Canada, forever after, if hon. gentlemen opposite have their way, will have their tariff proposals brought into this House for discussion, but beyond amendment. Those questions will not be for settlement in Canada, but for settlement by surreptitious negotiations carried on in Washington—and we have, shall have, to be satisfied with that which goes to the lesser as compared with the greater. And once they start to break us down in that connection, all legislation proposed in this House will be on that basis: Come to Washington and have a secret negotiation, and we will give you something that you must take to the parliament of Canada to be passed *holus bolus*. That is the danger of our situation, and it is the greatest danger that ever came to us. It is a great change, an enormous change, an organic change—and the proposal is introduced in this House without ever consulting the people with regard to it. Surely, a Liberal party, surely a party headed by one who has made the professions made by the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), would say that if there is to be an organic change, a change of autonomy, it should be only after the people have been consulted by a general election. But there is nothing of that kind. If there is a warrant, as was said a few moments ago by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), the only warrant for this change is that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his friends from 1887 to 1892 were advocates of commercial union. But when they proposed commercial union to the people of this country it was repudiated. Years after the government abandoned it. But, like the dog returning to its vomit, in this quiet and surreptitious way the proposal is made to resume these commercial union negotiations and to put Canada into a commercial union with the United States. And what was the folly of the right hon. gentleman—mention has been made here of 'green and salad days'—what was the folly of his political manhood has to-day become the suicidal madness of his later years, a thing that will bring himself and his party to destruction. I have no doubt that the people of this country to-day are determined to maintain their political autonomy, and above all to make their own tariffs. In that view the people of Canada will repudiate the right hon. gentleman's party in the next election, as they did in the election of 1891. For the proposal which is made—I say it again and insist upon it—means the surrender of our tariff autonomy. I got that idea from my late father, who, in discussing these questions in the old days, constantly insisted on the idea that if Canada was ever to pass beyond the tutelage of the old colonial position, as we

have done, it must be by absolute control of her own tariff. We fought it out in this country and took away the control of our tariff from the mother country, and it was the greatest assertion of Canadian independence that was ever made. To-day the government of this country proposes to give up that independence and hand that autonomy over to our rivals of the United States. That certainly is not in the line of progress, and yet that is the proposal to-day—that the old commercial union idea should be revived, that our tariff is to be made in the United States, and that the people of Canada are to have no voice in it. Can that be justified on any grounds? Will anybody say that a surreptitious treaty made by two or three representatives of each nation can take in the broad national aspect of the tariff? Why, in this country, it is proposed that we should have a permanent tariff board. In the United States that has become a practical question—to have a board of tariff experts to deal with the tariff in order that the very fullest consideration may be given to every element of every question arising, that witnesses may be called, that interests may be heard, and tariff schedules worked out that will best meet the conditions. Instead of all that, this new and tyrannical view of the constitution is to be asserted in this country, and people are never again—because it is not for this session or this tariff alone—to have a voice in parliament as to making the tariff, or as to the interpretation of any single item in it. Never was there such an abandonment of national rights and national autonomy as is contained in this Bill; never did any man who calls himself a Canadian have more reason to be ashamed when he sees such a proposal made in the House of Commons of Canada, a proposal to abandon our tariff autonomy and to hand it over to the people of the United States. Well may the people of the United States afford to make tariff concessions. They can tell their farmers: Yes, we are going to let in Canadian farm products, even if they do damage you, because we are not looking at the tariff; we are looking at the effect of this arrangement on national questions, at the effect it will have in raising the Stars and Stripes from Mexico to the Arctic ocean. Now, another aspect which has been raised by this discussion—

Mr. TALBOT. I rise to a point of order, as I see the hon. gentleman is proceeding with his speech. A moment ago he referred to the Liberal party, to the party on this side of the House, as a dog returning to his vomit. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, if you consider that expression parliamentary.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Certainly in no offensive sense at all, but in the or-