

ADDRESS.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

I am fully aware of the nature and importance of the place I occupy to-night. I fully appreciate the character and intelligence of the audience now before me, and the momentous subject I am dealing with; but I have a still greater appreciation of the larger audience represented by the American press. And while the sense of my responsibility is great, I feel that I have one great advantage, that while my audience may be intelligent and critical, that very intelligence will make them sympathize with truth, progress and the development of the human race, however lamely advocated.

I would have you remember that I do not in any official sense claim to represent the people of Canada. I only claim to represent a political party who believe not only in republican institutions in their purity and simplicity, but we also believe in the political union, or rather re-union, of that portion of the North American Continent lying north of the Rio Grande.

I have the honor to be the first, and as yet the only man in Canada who has offered himself openly for the highest position within the gift of my fellow countrymen. I refer to membership in our parliament with political union as the sole plank of my platform, I am therefore the only person regularly authorized to speak on this subject in a representative capacity.

The Restrictionist press declare that there is no annexationist sentiment in Canada, but they seem to be giving a great deal of attention to something that they claim has no existence. "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God," but that statement does not affect the fact. I learn that some of your people have abolished Hades with less difficulty than the government abolished slavery; however that may be, our newspapers have not abolished the union sentiment of that portion of this continent known as Canada. There is a great deal of discussion of the question, and to use a vulgarism, "there must be some fire where so much smoke exists."

Speaking of Hades, you doubtless have heard of the rancher out west who said: "Ingersoll says there is no Hell; I kind of think as he does, but I would give that yoke of steers to be right down sure of it." It is the same with a great many newspaper men, office holders, militia colonels, place men and monopolists who declare that annexation sentiment is a myth, but still they would give a great deal to be real sure that a majority of the people of Canada were not in favor of Continental union.

I am frequently asked by people on either side of the line how the public pulse throbs on the other side with regard to union. I have known many citizens of the United States and some newspapers say: "We don't want Canada;" that may be partially true, but it is very misleading when expressed in those words. I want the ladies of this city to know that I am a single man and of fancy free, and I want a wife very much, but while that is the case I am in just the same position as Uncle Sam, I don't want anybody badly enough to take one who would not be glad to accept me.

With regard to Canadian destiny, the United States have adopted the only policy that would be

becoming a powerful, dignified and self-governing nation. I fully realize that the first steps towards union, or the symptoms of a desire for it, must come from Canada. The United States is debarred from doing anything that would have the appearance of coercion or undue interference with the autonomy of her weaker neighbor, and there would not be wanting plenty ready to give even a fair honorable advance on the part of this republic, a false and malicious interpretation.

Besides, international etiquette would not permit the United States to approach one of the dependencies of a foreign power with such an end in view; hence I say Canada is the only party perfectly free to approach this country on this question without being misunderstood or humiliated. She alone could do it without loss of prestige or dignity, in fact some such act is expected of us by Great Britain and other nations, for everyone knows that we are in an embryonic or chrysalis state.

I will quote the words of several members of the British Parliament of world wide reputation. The great John Bright said at Rochdale as long as December 4th, 1861:

I should say that if a man had a great heart within him he would rather look forward to the day when from that point of land which is habitable nearest the pole to the shores of the great gulf the whole of that vast continent might become one great confederation of states—without a great army and a great navy—not mixing itself up with the entanglements of European politics—without a custom house inside through the whole length and breadth of its territory—and with freedom everywhere, law everywhere, peace everywhere—such a confederation would afford at least some hope that man is not forsaken of Heaven, and that the future of our race may be better than the past.

At Birmingham on December 18th, of the following year he said:

I see one vast confederation stretching from the frozen north in unbroken line to the glowing south, and from the wild bitows of the Atlantic westward to the calmer waters of the Pacific in—in, and I see on one people, and one language, and one law, and one faith, and over all that wide continent the homo of freedom, and a refuge for the oppressed of every race and every clime.

Then Mr. Henry Labouchere, M.P., the famous editor of London *Truth*, said:

If I was a Canadian I am inclined to think I should cut the connection with England, but being an Englishman, I have no wish that Canada should do so. I would rather be master in my own house, even if it were a cottage, than live in a sort of a back garden to a nobleman's mansion. The stronger and more powerful Canada becomes, the more American it will become, and the more anxious you would become to cast adrift from a European connection. Whether it will be an independent republic or whether it joins the United States will depend very much on the consensus of popular opinion at the moment of separation. Where I a Canadian I should be in favor of union with the States. It seems to me a very grand idea that one continent should have one government not the despotism of an individual, but the deliberate will of a nation.

In view of the foregoing one would think that Canadians could reasonably consider any scheme for the promotion of their own welfare. The words of these broad-souled, broad-minded men are a standing rebuke to our narrow-minded, small-souled colonial jingos.

Ex-Ald. Henry W. Darling, Ex-President of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, in his address to "The Union League Club," of Chicago, was speak-