

consequences or results of the pact or agreement which they made, and I have no doubt they were surprised when they found that in the operation of this Favoured Nation Clause they had allowed all these other nations free right to come rushing into Canada with their products, while Canada was not to be permitted to enter the gates of any one of them with hers. (Loud applause.)

### **ANNEXATION CLEARLY THE OBJECT.**

Now then, Sir, that is all I intend to say with regard to the material or more sordid aspect of this pact or agreement. Just a word or two, however, about the annexation, or, I was going to say, with reference to the more patriotic view—but in view of the terrible assault of my honourable friends opposite the other day, on a very inoffensive member of this House to the effect that patriotism, as Dr. Johnson used to say, was the last refuge of a scoundrel, I do not know, Sir, whether I am so ready to put myself in the class of scoundrels. (Laughter). However, I suppose if I go into it for a few minutes with Sir George W. Ross, Honourable E. J. Davis and a few more of the chums and bed-fellows of the honourable gentlemen (Renewed laughter and applause.) who taught him his first lessons of political virtue, I may be able even to stand up under the appellation of scoundrel coming from the honourable gentleman with reference to patriotism. (Applause.)

It is said that annexation is not their object. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking now to over a hundred intelligent men of the Province of Ontario, and I ask every honourable gentleman here whether there has ever been an instance in their recollection when they had a conversation with an intelligent American citizen, and they brought the matter up for discussion, when that American citizen did not say distinctly that he expected Canada to come in with the United States, that he believed it would be infinitely better for Canada to come, and that it would be better for the United States to have Canada? I say there is no an intelligent American in the ninety millions of American people who has not that desire and intention at the back of his mind (Applause), not one! And if this were not so, how otherwise can the use of such language as Mr. Taft used be understood? If he were not thinking of annexation, why should he say that Canada was at the parting of the ways? Why should it occur to him that Canada should not keep on in the old pathway she has travelled for generations? How did he come to think anything at all