

cause twenty-five years ago Conservatives had done so. That was a sample of the moss-grown Toryism which one often read about, but which never existed. He asked why Sir George Ross, Hon. Clifford Sifton, and Hon. E. J. Davis, the Opposition leader's "neighbor and chum," had found a new path.

#### No Sentiment In It.

The Prime Minister complained that the only argument of the Opposition speakers on the subject had been that somebody would get two and a half cents more for lamb or some other product. Sentiment was a matter that had never been discussed except by the Liberal leader, and then only to a slight extent. Their whole argument was that this or that product would return the farmers a few cents more. The member for Haldimand had argued as if the whole question was wrapped up in the cattle markets of Buffalo and Toronto.

#### An "Astonishing" Amendment.

Sir James took strong exception to Hon. Mr. MacKay's amendment as the "most astonishing, most surprising," before the House, and read the last clause in which the Liberal leader deprecated the expression of views that the loyalty of Canada was purchasable by tariff concessions. It was an amendment the like of which had never been introduced before in any Legislature of the Province of Ontario.

"I challenge anyone to justify that statement, to show anywhere any public man, any man of prominence, or any responsible newspaper that has made any utterances to justify it."

#### About Sir William Van Horne.

The Prime Minister attempted to ridicule Hon. Mr. MacKay's illustrations in supporting reciprocity. In commenting upon Sir William Van Horne's sweeping condemnation of the agreement the Liberal leader on Thursday pointed out that such patriotic utterances did not ring altogether true from the man who had taken money gathered in Ontario and had invested it in enterprises in Cuba.

"What," asked Sir James, "has Cuba to do with the question of whether the people of Canada are wise or foolish in adopting this reciprocity treaty?"

#### No Straight Answers.

There was, asserted Sir James, no attempt or pretence at an attempt on the part of the other side to answer the straightforward language and statements of President Taft, James J. Hill, Champ Clark and Senator Beveridge. The latter would soon be in Toronto, and we should have the opportunity of seeing the gentleman who was so outspoken as to declare his intention of bringing back some of the American capital that had been invested in Canada. Sir James declared that annexation—not forcible, of course—was the avowed object of many of the public men and private citizens of the United States in favoring the agreement. "I apprehend," said he, "the people of Canada will not be decoyed away from the old pathway, at any rate by men of alien nationality, who don't conceal from the world at large their intention to put every possible obstruction in the way of consolidating our connection with the Empire."

#### Not Five Hundred For Separation.

"With all humility I say, as a Canadian citizen," said Sir James, "as one of those who rejoice in being a British subject, and without regard to political party, I feel like repeating some words spoken by me over three years ago in this House, in conversation with a prominent English statesman, in discussing the question of the Canadian future, that I did not know, I did not believe, you could find five hundred men, who could read and write, between Vancouver and Newfoundland, who would stand up in public and say they would favor separation from the Empire or annexation with the United States."

#### "Banged, Bolted and Barred."

"But," he continued, "things move fast in these days, and if you come to a day when you hear our English statesmen tell us that the doors are banged and bolted and barred against everything in the nature of a preference, and the British preference is

steadily, year by year, refused to us, and we have the power to negotiate commercial treaties, who can tell that something may not happen, say five years from now, that will bring the question up in an unexpected manner, and what may be the result of that? How can we guarantee what the opinion of our people will be, say, fifteen or twenty years hence, when perhaps some great question will come up to be decided in a manner that may require immediate decision? It may be it will take a little more than the sordid reason of a little difference of a few cents on a lamb or a dollar or so on a hog to lead them to abandon that sense of their happiness and prosperity which has been with them so many years."