

ing in favor of Free Trade, but his statements and arguments apply with still greater force in favor of union. On that occasion he stated:

"I have said that nature seems to point most unmistakably to the benefits of an arrangement of this kind. For example, we find in the Maritime Provinces, which nature has placed within such easy reach of your manufacturing state of New York, an almost unlimited supply of coal, peculiarly suited for their purposes. A similar state of things exists in British Columbia, where almost at the water's edge the coal can be placed in ocean-going ships, and conveyed to San Francisco and other ports on your Pacific Coast. The very articles which at these points, nature has practically deprived you of.

Then looking at the Province of Ontario, which nature has dovetailed almost into the heart of your country, we are short of the heat and steam-producing fuel, which your mines in Pennsylvania and Ohio seem to have been placed by a beneficent Providence to supply; but the politicians stepped in and, for a time, placed the barriers of custom house duties upon the free interchange of these necessities of our commercial life; and said in effect, 'the Jew shall have no dealings with the Samaritans,' and so with other products. Our Ontario barley, which is as necessary to your malsters as your Indian corn is to our distillers and farmers, the politicians have said 'we shall only exchange by the payment of a duty upon either side'; and so from one end of this imaginary line to the other, the natural tendencies of the people on either side are thwarted; and their industry deprived of its legitimate reward by these artificial barriers which the politicians have imposed."

According to the greatest minds in both countries and Europe, union is our manifest destiny, and if it is desirable and inevitable, why not have it now and let us, as well as posterity, enjoy its fruits. What would you think of a man and woman of twenty-five years of age making up their minds to marry and waiting until they were old before consummating the union?

Let there be honest, open avowal, free and kindly discussion on both sides of the line and you will see how soon we will remove all causes of friction and ill-will and dwell together in unity, peace, righteousness and prosperity.

Perhaps you would like to know just how the Canadian people feel on the question. I can only estimate and approximate; I will tell you what I do know and you can estimate for yourselves.

But I will first briefly refer to our alternatives that have of late engaged a large amount of public attention in Canada; and I could not put the matter more tersely and directly than by quoting the words of the Hon. J. W. Longley, Attorney-General for Nova Scotia:

"Speaking in general terms, it may be said that Canadians have the choice of at least four alternatives:—

First.—Remaining as we are, a colonial possession of the Empire.

Second.—A direct political alliance with the Empire, involving representation in the national councils and a share in the responsibilities and achievements of the whole nation.

Third.—Political union with the great English nation lying beside us on this continent, with whom we are intimately associated and connected by geography, race, language, laws and civilization.

Fourth.—An independent nationality, with our own flag and our own national responsibilities."

As to remaining as we are, a colonial dependency of Great Britain; that is simply out of the question, for the reasons given and to be given throughout my address this evening, and innumerable other reasons that need not be given, for the fact is generally, I might say universally, accepted.

The second alternative has been given the shorter name of "Imperial Federation." It is the last desperate fevered creation of a deceased Jingo

brain, and its very name is objectionable. We want nothing with the word "Imperial" in it, if I mistake not the spirit of the new generation of native Canadians who have the say in Canada.

That great thinker and master of English, Goldwin Smith, has disposed of the Imperial Federation oraze with one brief argument. He claims that no Federation is possible unless based on the broad ground of individual political equality. And should the present British Empire federate on that basis 200,000,000 Hindoos would outvote the rest of the Empire three to one, and the capital of the Empire would naturally be Bombay or Calcutta. I think that Professor Smith has disposed of "Imperial Federation."

The third course open to us is my subject to-night and I will for the present pass on to the fourth, commonly called "Canadian Independence."

I will not trouble you with my views so long as I can compel my opponents to supply my arguments, and I quote the following from the pen of the moving spirit among the Imperial Federationists, a Mr. J. C. Hopkin, who, by the way, is a native of North Dakota, U. S. He said:

"Independence is a dangerous dream. Independence for Canada means dependence upon the United States; diplomatic weakness abroad; inability to protect our rights and privileges; the necessity of an enormous expenditure on defensive armament; increased debt and a steadily growing taxation as a consequence of added burdens; loss of possible trade preferences in the British market or chance of a treaty with the United States short of commercial annexation; provincial difficulties without any increased federal powers. It involves a similar declaration of independence by Australia; the loss to England of her coaling stations, harbors and fortresses and the command of the sea; the destruction of her prestige and the possible loss of India; in short the disruption and destruction of the British Empire."

My opponent, though not regarded as a political heavy-weight, has proved conclusively that Canadian Independence is "a dangerous dream."

Goldwin Smith has proved that "Imperial Federation" cannot even be discussed without provoking laughter and pity; and the commercial and agricultural depression, together with the depopulation of Canada, shows that colonialism must cease or we will have to hand Canada over to the public creditor and let her go back to a state of nature, for we can no longer afford to maintain Canada as a breeding ground to supply the United States with her best citizens.

I have undertaken to tell you what I know of the progress of union sentiment, so that you may be able to form your own opinion. I could give you the names of hundreds of public men who favor the cause, but they do not wish to declare themselves until they have a press and organized party to back them, and they argue that to declare for union until they have these auxiliaries, would only be depriving themselves of influence they now possess, with no real advantage to the cause; I differ with them entirely, and must and do respect their opinions. I would be guilty of a breach of confidence were I to make their names public, but we have some men who hold the liberty of free thought and free speech dearer even than their influence or position, and the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice for Ontario is one of these far-seeing, fearless and upright men, and as he makes no secret of the fact, I feel that I am guilty of no breach of confidence when I make it known, particularly when he did not confide in me the fact is already common property. Of course