

address. I am doing nothing at the moment but pointing out to you the road that we are on, and suggesting what its termination will be, if we do not turn from it. I am not pretending either, that independence under the British Crown is a position free from objection. There are, indeed, examples, but not of the most encouraging character, of two countries with no other organic union than a common King — such as England and Scotland under the Stuarts, and Great Britain and Hanover under the Georges. The first of these ended in political union, and the second in complete separation. How long the United Kingdom and Canada would continue to acknowledge the same Sovereign, no one can venture to say. Some untoward incident might speedily terminate the situation; but if the Canadian schemes of imperial coöperation are allowed free play, a vast increase in sympathy and interest might prolong it indefinitely.

I have no time to dwell upon these schemes, or to trace the difficulties which Canada has encountered in getting them into operation. I can do little else than mention them.

First, there is the Canadian system of imperial preferences. Canada has converted the Empire, with the sole exception of the United Kingdom, to that great idea, and by converting Mr. Chamberlain has so impressed the sole dissentient that a strong political party is now advocating colonial preferences.

*Imperial coöperation in trade.*

Secondly, there is the Canadian idea of imperial cables — direct and cheap communication with all parts of the Empire, and landings upon territory of the Empire only. Thanks to Sir Sandford Fleming's persistence, we have already a large instalment of such cables, owned and managed by various parts of the Empire. *Imperial coöperation in telegraphy.*

Thirdly, there is the Canadian idea of cheap imperial