

conservation question is a peculiar one. I am raising steers in the west, and my experience has been that I have had to keep my steers from spring to fall because I could put them into market, though not of recent years. I am bound to say I imagine the leader of the opposition, on learning of my difficulties, saying to me: What we have we hold. My reply would naturally be that if that refers to the farm I agree with you, but if it refers to the steers I don't agree with you. Annexation, Mr. Chairman, means revolution. Let us understand what this blessed word annexation means. There was an old lady in England who never got any good from a sermon unless several times the blessed word Mesopotamia was mentioned, and without that blessed word annexation what would our friends opposite have left to say?

Annexation means the dismantling of these buildings, it means the hauling down of our flag, it means going to Washington to hold our parliamentary sittings. Is there a man or a woman who believes in his heart of hearts that that is possible to come to pass in this country? Annexation means revolution and my little reading of history tells me that revolution has never taken place in this world except amongst a discontented people. When Charles the First drove things to a certain point there was a considerable revolution in Britain, ending in the cutting off of the King's head. A few years afterwards his son had a discontented people and was driven from the throne in the revolution of 1688. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) can tell the House far better than I can what was the condition of France before the great revolution in that country. In 1838-39 in this country of Canada the people were discontented and there was danger of revolution. In America itself, it was the discontent of the people with taxes and with the restriction of their rights to trade with other nations that led to revolution. But the argument of my hon. friend is that Canadians are of such a type that they will say: We have such freedom and prosperity under the red, white and blue that we will haul it down.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked the government how they dared do certain things. I should like to ask him how he dared use in the Canadian parliament and with the knowledge that his words would be read by the Canadian people, the words: Conquest by gifts. He said we could not be beaten but the conquest of Canada—he mentioned these words in the parliament of Canada—the conquest of Canada is to be brought about by gifts. If I had dared to use such words, the kindest friends I have on this side of the House would have taken me to the Atlantic at once and have deported me. We at

least on this side of the House have not met the type of Canadians with whom he has been consorting. We on this side who represent and will represent for many a day, I think, a large majority of Canadian people, have been consorting with such Canadians that we know we have a people here who cannot be beaten and cannot be bought.

There is an interesting historic parallel between what happened in the House of representatives in a vote there a few days ago and the vote that took place on the repeal of the corn laws in Great Britain. A Conservative leader in Great Britain carried the repeal of the corn laws by a minority of his own followers but supported by the entire force almost of the Liberals of the House, and in the United States a great republican leader in the person of Mr. Taft was appointed I think also by a minority of his own followers but by almost the entire strength of the democratic party. I wonder if, when this reciprocity arrangement goes through in this House, there will be any break in the ranks I see opposite to me? I fear not, I fear that the darkness will be impenetrable and that the suitable wailing will be provided by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) and the gnashing of teeth in abundance by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) says there is an element of instability in this arrangement. We have been told on every hand there will be disturbance of trade. Well it is very likely that some one may be temporarily incommoded or hurt; that is always the case in the history of human progress in scientific invention as well as in politics. One remembers how the hand loom weavers of Lancashire tore down the first machinery put up to replace the work of the hand loom workers. They did not see that for each hand loom worker thrown out of occupation, twenty others would get work making the machine that was to displace their work. The great scientist Humboldt says that when travelling in the Andes in South America he found a place where men had a profitable business carrying passengers over certain passes in the mountains in baskets. A better government came into power and made good roads, and the basket carriers petitioned the government not to make the roads because it would hurt the business of the basket carriers. Of course the government went on with the mending of the roads. I suppose that when gas was first invented there were some dealers in candles who had a very large stock on hand and who might not be able to dispose of them so well with gas, but nobody proposed on that ground to go back to the use of farthing dips. Farthing dips might indeed be a fitting illuminant for