

made in a humorous or jocular vein. There is not the slightest indication of it. Then he continues :

They are people of our blood. They speak our language. Their institutions are much like ours. They are trained in the difficult art of self-government. My judgment is that if the treaty of 1854 had never been abrogated the chances of a consolidation of these two countries would have been much greater than they are now.

Then he was interrupted with a question :

Mr. MARTIN, of South Dakota. Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and making free trade with Canada on all products?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. By taking Canada in to become a part of the United States; yes.

There was nothing apparently humorous or jocular in that statement. Further on he was interrupted in this way :

Mr. NORTON. I wanted to ask the gentleman something along the lines of universal peace. As I understand it, the gentleman favours this Bill for at least one reason, that it will have a tendency in the end to bring Canada into the union.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Yes, I have no doubt about that.

Mr. MORRIS. Will that have a tendency to preserve peace with Great Britain?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Why, certainly it will. I do not have any doubt whatever that the day is not far distant when Great Britain will joyfully see all of her North American possessions become a part of this republic. That is the way things are tending now.

It is thus clear that Mr. Clark's observations were perfectly serious and were part of a serious discussion.

There are a great many other observations in Mr. Clark's speech of a very important character so far as the economic features of this proposed arrangement are concerned. I do not intend to go into these to-day, but shall later on for the purpose of showing that the government could not have chosen a more inopportune time and occasion for entering into these negotiations. Mr. Clark distinctly declared that in addition to his reasons which I have already quoted, for desiring that this treaty should be accepted, he considered it merely an instalment of the tariff changes which the Democratic party were prepared to carry out the moment they had control of Congress. In other words, when the Democratic party gets control of Congress, they would, if we had not been in such haste, have given us every advantage we might possibly gain under this treaty, and it would not have been necessary for this country to make any of the sacrifices entailed by the proposal now before parliament. The whole situation as at present

developed, shows in what an unfortunate position the government have placed the country when it brings down a tariff to parliament and says you must accept or reject it as a whole. There is a very radical difference between a secret tariff made by diplomatic methods and a tariff proposed to parliament to be considered and passed under the ordinary parliamentary procedure prevailing in this country and in the United Kingdom. In the one case, as in 1894, 1897 and 1907, the government comes to parliament with proposals that have been worked out by the government themselves, and which they present to parliament for its serious consideration; and in the instances to which I have alluded dozens of amendments, and on at least one occasion, hundreds of amendments, were made to the proposals as brought down. But in the present instance, no discretion of the kind is left us. We are told by the government that they have secretly consented to a certain arrangement, which may work injustice to us in many ways, but which we must either reject or approve as a whole. We are in fact asked to give our approval merely as a matter of form. As the right hon. gentleman himself said in 1895 with regard to a somewhat similar transaction: We must either swallow or reject it, *holus bolus*. It is unfortunate that the government should have placed parliament in such a situation. A tariff worked out in secret by diplomatic methods and then presented in such a way as to preclude any amendment or alteration by this House is bound to lead to dissatisfaction and trouble. Further than that, I am firmly persuaded that it would have been much wiser for Canada and for the United States each to deal with its own tariff in every instance, as seemed best without any understanding of this kind. I venture to affirm that an arrangement of this kind, adopted under such conditions cannot fail to lead to complications, irritation and discontent, and to a disturbance of the good relations which have up to the present prevailed between the two countries. An experiment of this kind has been tried before. It has been tried between the dominions of the empire under the British flag, and experience has shown that it has led to irritation, friction and dissatisfaction.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (York). I propose to say a few words on this question from the national standpoint which has induced my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to submit this resolution. As regards the suggestion that the proposed arrangement contains the germ of annexation to the United States, I believe it does, but I believe also that Canadians are strong enough in their devotion to their