

over the neighboring Republic, was that it was a cheap country to live in. Another advantage, which I think we do possess, is, that we are living under a flag which our people were taught to revere, and we are proud to look to the prestige of old England, to her laws and institutions, to follow her example in protecting the liberties of the people, which she has so well inaugurated; and I trust we will yet be glad to follow her example in her trade policy.

HON. GENTLEMEN—No, no!

HON. MR. McCLELAN—We have failed to follow the example of England, and is it not natural that, having infringed upon the principles of freedom, which British statesmen have laid down, and having abandoned every principle of trade that is free and open, and increased the burden of public debt to some \$250,000,000,—and, according to present appearances, before we meet here again it will be \$300,000,000—until we are more heavily in debt, in proportion to our population, than are the people of the United States to-day, while ours is being increased, and theirs is being reduced, is it any wonder, therefore, that it has resulted in alienating the people, and sending them from the country? I say that when these things exist, and when this policy exists, it is natural that many of our people will say to themselves, that of two evils we will choose the less.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have referred to the speech of Sir A. T. Galt, which I think is conclusive.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He has changed his opinions since then.

HON. MR. POWER—He had ten thousand reasons for changing them.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Yes, while occupying his position as High Commissioner at \$10,000 a year and a mansion. It is necessary, since it makes it more interesting, to refer to the opinions of other prominent men, and in pursuing

that line, I will refer to a manifesto that was issued in the year 1849, and largely signed.

HON. MR. READ—That is before some of us were born.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am not going any further back than the hon. gentlemen who preceded me on the other side—I am not going so far back. If they undertook to go into history to prove the relations of one country with another—the trade relations, and give the opinions of prominent men as far back as Henry Clay—I think he was quoted by the hon. gentleman from Belleville himself, who said that Henry Clay had been a free-trader, and had changed to be a protectionist—I am justified in referring to the manifesto of 1849, which was signed by a great many prominent individuals in this country, and that is the reason why I shall give their opinions now: it is quite relevant to the discussion of this question. I am not finding any fault with those gentlemen for the opinions here expressed; I merely refer to them as a matter of history. It was a time of depression; it was a time at all events at which a number of influential, prominent, and astute people (the burning of the Parliament Buildings at Montreal happened under the same *regime* I believe) apparently had a large public meeting, at which a manifesto was drafted, by which they were proposing to revolutionize this country altogether, and in doing it they went about it very systematically, and debated one plan after another. It no doubt went very much against the grain of some of those hon. gentlemen at any rate to cut themselves adrift from the old flag. They had no doubt a considerable amount of the sentiment of loyalty in them, and although the times were hard and they were not making so much money in those years as before or since, still they felt that if they could recoup themselves in any other way than by a severance from England they would be glad to do so, but they could find no other way, and finding no other way they were prepared to take the step—cross the Rubicon, and unite with the United States. Yet my hon. friend says that he wonders now at individuals leaving this country for the

HON. MR. McCLELAN.