

United States, when on the occasion I refer to nearly one thousand prominent men said over their own handwriting that they were prepared to come under United States jurisdiction.

HON. MR. SMITH—Things are in a very different state in Canada to-day.

HON. MR. PLUMB—How many years ago was that?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—They undertook to discuss the question of protection—the revival of protection in the markets of the United Kingdom; secondly the protection of home manufactures. In the remark on this they say that although this might encourage the growth of a manufacturing interest in Canada, yet without access to the United States market there would not be a sufficient expansion of that interest, from the want of consumers, to work any result that could be admitted as a “remedy” for the numerous evils of which they complain. That was a sensible and reasonable view which those wealthy and intelligent men entertained at that time. In the third place, discussing “a federal union of the British American provinces,” they came to the conclusion that it would be no remedy, and it was therefore abandoned.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—We had only half the population then that we have now.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The fourth proposition was the “Independence of the British North American Colonies as a Federal Republic.” That was discussed and found not to be a panacea. The fifth proposition was “reciprocal free trade with the United States as regards the products of the farm, the forest and the mine.” This they concluded “if obtained would yield but an instalment of the many advantages which might otherwise be secured.” The free interchange of such products would not introduce manufactures into our country. It would not give us the North American continent for our market. It would neither so amend our constitution as to confer stability, nor insure confidence in its permanence, nor would it allay the violence of parties,

nor in the slightest degree remedy many of our prominent evils. The sixth proposition sets forth:

“Of all the remedies that have been suggested for the acknowledged and insufferable ills with which our country is afflicted, there remains but one to be considered. It propounds a sweeping and important change in our political and social condition involving considerations which demand our most serious examination. *This remedy consists in a friendly and peaceful separation from British connection, and a union upon equitable terms with the great North American Confederacy of sovereign states.*”

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend does not pretend to say that that is the feeling in Canada now.

HON. MR. POWER—Did not the late High Commissioner sign that manifesto?

HON. MEMBERS—Read! Names!

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The signers arranged alphabetically are very numerous, but I will give you some of them. First there is Abbott, J. J. C., (hear, hear), Anderson, J. B., Grant, Glassford, &c. Among the Macs is observed the name of Macpherson, D. L., and others equally prominent representing all shades of politics.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—We had not Confederation then and we had not a National Policy. Does my hon. friend say that the feeling in the country now is in favor of annexation?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am merely referring to the opinions of public men upon a former occasion, when this manifesto was produced. I did not intend to bring out so prominently the sixth proposition in the manifesto, as others which were rejected. They were opposed to protection, and thought that it would not in the slightest degree remedy many of the existing evils. At the risk of being considered tedious, I wish to refer to the opinions of some other prominent men. I will now read from a Prince Edward Island newspaper of September 14th, 1878, the report of a meeting at Alberton: