

to express a kindly sentiment towards me, and especially in recognition of my efforts to enlighten the American people as to the greater half of the Continent to the North.

"But Mr. Glen utterly and completely fails to apprehend the real sentiments of the Canadian people in relation to annexation with the United States. He is a pronounced annexationist and is anxious that this country should go to any length to achieve a political union. He would thus obliterate not only the barrier that now divides the English speaking race on this Continent, but remove from this Continent the last vestige of Great-Britain's domination. This is the almost universal dream of the average American, who without much thought indulges in it, but in our time it is nothing but a dream. Because Mr. Glen in a certain sense represents a sentiment very broadly existing, it is important his views should be shown to be impossible. The advocacy of Annexation is its surest defeat, so far as Canada is concerned, and, grateful as I am for the interest Mr. Glen evokes and the kindly words he has uttered, nevertheless I believe that he is doing infinite harm in his advocacy of political union. This advocacy keeps the people apart. It is fatal to the cause of reciprocity, which would bring them together quicker than anything else for the purposes of trade, and it is trade we are after these days rather than territory.

"It is a conviction in the minds of annexationists that the surest preventative of annexation is reciprocity. The annexationist argues that to give a free and unrestricted interchange of products and manufactures would be to afford to Canada all the material advantages which she would gain by annexation. To deny her reciprocity would be to force her into annexation, if such a thing were possible, which it is not. Hence you will see that annexation and reciprocity, at any rate for the present moment, do not go hand in hand. That the advocacy of reciprocity postpones annexation is equally true.