

protectionist basis, but really upon a far deeper issue—that of national existence. No doubt this was disclaimed by the Opposition. No doubt Sir Richard Cartwright comes of a good loyal stock. No doubt Mr. Laurier would deprecate a union which would dwarf the importance of his race and religion, but, covered up though it was in every way, the issue was there, and the quick sense of

THE PEOPLE DETECTED IT AT ONCE.

They felt that, in a "dicker" with the United States Government, the national independence was safer in the hands of the present Cabinet than in that of their opponents.

"That a proposition to permit the United States Government to regulate our commerce and settle our tariff should have secured even the measure of support it did, ought to suggest much searching of conscience to our present rulers. The power proposed to be handed over so frankly to Washington we had won after a long and hard struggle with our own motherland. It was a thing above all others of which we were most jealous, and yet, at the last election, an important minority voted apparently to yield it up to the United States. Any stone is good enough to throw at a political antagonist and, once in power, the Opposition would feel its responsibilities; but to permit Congress to close our ports against Great Britain, by means of the McKinley tariff or any such Chinese legislation as it may adopt, is not a declaration of independence—something might be said for that—but a renunciation of independence and a declaration of abject dependence which would stagger the self-respect of the smallest Central American republic. Such a policy would rapidly diminish the imports from England and France and utterly destroy our own manufactures. Then after ten or twelve years, the Detroit experience would be repeated. We should be told that we ought not to expect the advantages of free trade with the United States unless we are prepared to share all the burdens of citizens. Then with our manufactures ruined and our self-respect gone we should be compelled to sneak by a back way into the American Union, instead of entering it like free men by free men's votes. But, say "superior persons," why resist the inevitable? Annexation must come sooner or later, and they point to the wealth of the United States—its millionaires, the greatest in the world. The reply is easy. Very rich men are not a strength but a weakness to a state. (Hear, hear). Enormous disparity of fortune has always been a sign of impending change, and the stability of a state rests rather upon the absence of very poor men than upon the presence of very rich ones. Again the *Review of Reviews* assures us, in connection with a portrait of Mr. Wiman, that "Canada is the outer fringe" upon a great industrial community of which it should normally be an integral portion. Canada has not the material resources of the United States, but she has existed independent of them since the settlement of America; first as French Canada, then as Canada of the exiles, and now as Canada of a united people, and there seems to a Canadian no reason why she should not continue independent. Moreover, let it be granted that eventually that is her fate, it is no reason why she should rush to it. A man of sense does not shoot himself because he must die some day. (Cheers and laughter.) A good deal has been said at various times in our history