

that I feel a delicacy in rising to address the Senate on this occasion. Knowing that I am following a gentleman whose intellectual ability, and whose position in the country as one of our most eminent lawyers, and a former leader of this House, makes him eminently above and beyond me in eloquence and ability, I therefore feel somewhat diffident in attempting to fill the place he so worthily occupied in this House. Notwithstanding that, I have learned during my political career that whatever position in life I might be called to fill, I should attempt to do my duty to my country first and to myself afterwards. I have to congratulate, and I do so sincerely, the mover and seconder of the Address on the ability which they displayed in dealing with the questions now before the country. The mover presented to the House many facts, which were not only interesting to those who listened to him, but will be instructive to those who read them in the public press. My own impression is that those facts were of a character which deserved much more consideration, and that too of a favourable nature, than they received from the hon. gentleman who replied and who holds the position of leader of the Opposition in this Chamber. It seems to me that the hon. member from Welland, quoting as he did from the foremost statisticians of the world, and drawing his deductions from the figures which are presented to the country through the medium of the Trade and Navigation Reports, might at least have had his remarks accepted as carrying with them that weight which such statistics should carry and not have been treated in the flippant manner in which they were, with mere formal generalities such as we read every day in the smallest village newspaper in the country. I say this with all respect to the gentleman whom I am following, but I cannot help thinking that in a body like this, in dealing with great questions of state and the position of the country, we should try and draw our conclusions from facts as they are presented to us rather than repeat the stale platitudes which we hear and read every day in the week. I am also inclined to think that the hon. gentleman opposite, in his references to the remarks made by the hon. Senator from Welland regarding what he termed the pessimistic ideas of politicians and others in Canada, would have done better had he dealt with the

real questions at issue rather than to fall back upon the ground that the hon. Senator from Welland had attacked the loyalty of the party which the hon. gentleman opposite so worthily leads in the Senate. I was delighted to hear from the hon. gentleman that the party which he leads, and to which he belongs, is not disloyal. No one, I think, said that it was. But to say that there are disloyal men in that party, to say that there are men connected with that party who have proved themselves traitors, is not to accuse the whole party of being traitors. I was pleased also to hear him say that nearly the whole of his party were as loyal as the most loyal Tory in the country. Well, if that is so, Canada is safe for some time to come against any progress towards the annexation of this country to the neighbouring Republic. The hon. gentleman was following in the footsteps of his Ontario leader, when the latter stated, at the Board of Trade banquet the other day, that he knew of but one man who avowed himself in favour of annexation to the United States, and that he was very glad to know that that one did not belong to the Liberal party. I have a distinct recollection, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman to whom I refer, the Premier of Ontario, also remembers, that when he occupied a seat in the old Parliament of Canada there was a gentleman who represented the then town of Brockville, who uttered the same sentiments in the old Parliament of Canada that had been uttered by the local member for Essex, and I am glad to know that he did not belong to the Conservative party. I am also reminded, and must be led to the conclusion—and I presume the House and the country must also come to the conclusion—that the hon. leader of the Opposition is in unison with the Premier of Ontario, and that he is not in unison with and has no belief in the sentiments uttered by a late editor of the leading paper which is supposed to echo—nay, not only echo, but utter the sentiments of gentlemen opposite. It will be remembered that the writer of the famous letter to Mr. Hitt of the United States, told the people of that country that every man of the party with which he was connected, and for whom he was writing in a leading newspaper of this country, preferred annexation when he preached commercial union, and that the