

such a unanimous result ensued after that speech.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The hon. gentleman says it is not a correct report of his remarks.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—It is the report of the secretary of the meeting.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is a partisan report.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—For the purpose of varying the matter a little, I will refer to an English authority, and will show that now, on the eve of an election in England, when so much has been attempted by certain parties to get a share of the loaves and fishes, a great deal has been said there about fair trade with a view of seducing the farmers and humbugging them and leading them astray on this matter of trade. On the eve of a new election, when they have had this plank in their platform of fair trade, the Tories of England are in full retreat on the question, and are most ingloriously backing down on the fair trade policy.

The farmers and the workers in all lines in England are unwilling to take the bait. They know full well how to count the cost of any duty on food and the other necessities of life. They remember some of them the terrible times prior to the repeal of the corn law. Higher rents, dearer bread, more costly products, and consequently keener competition in the markets of the world.

Now, I come to the point I wish to make, and I will give the opinion of a very prominent gentleman, I think the leader of the great Conservative party of England—I speak of Sir Stafford Northcote. At a great political meeting in Somersetshire, to inaugurate the campaign in the Conservative interest, Sir Stafford Northcote was invited to attend, and replied by letter, in which he advised them to disclaim the "Protection Heresy." Said Sir Stafford :—

The Tory Premier, Peel, abolished the corn duties, and a return of the protectionist policy is impossible while the Conservative party lives to combat it. The idea that any Tory Government would return to the tax on cereals is groundless. Teach the English people that.

HON. MR. POWER—When was that letter writt n ?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have not seen the letter, but I see it referred to in an English paper.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What is good for an old country may not be suitable for a new country like Canada.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The letter from which I have quoted, was written to a conservative meeting held quite recently. With the permission of the House I shall now read the opinion of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, on fair trade, I quote from a report in the *London Mail* of September 23rd, 1881 :—

Yesterday evening a new Liberal club and association, which has been founded at Penrith, was inaugurated by a public meeting, held in the market-hall of that town. Mr. Henry Howard, of Greystoke Castle, presided, and among the speakers were Mr. E. Stafford Howard, M.P., Mr. George Howard, M.P., the Hon. A. D. Elliott, M.P., and Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, who on rising was loudly cheered, said there had been a great many conferences and congresses of late, but a meeting such as they were holding that night for the promotion of Liberal principles, was more useful than any of them. The late Lord Beaconsfield had explained some ten or fifteen years ago what great trouble he had had to educate his party; but now that he was gone it seemed as if the Conservatives, or some of them, were slipping back to some of the practices of the old-world Toryism. Some of them were crying for a return to the protection of British industry. They did not call it protection, they called it "reciprocity," or a policy of retaliation. A man who had aliases was generally a man of bad character. (Laughter.) Here was protection skulking about the country under the aliases of reciprocity and retaliation, and that ought to be enough to put people on their guard against such dangerous characters. (Cheers and laughter.) It did not do to put this thing down by brute force and call these people fools because they were going in for protection. Mr. Bright, in his righteous zeal, was vexed with them, and he was not going to find fault with him, but instead of calling them fools they should argue with them. That was the only way to treat anybody who you thought held erroneous opinions. In the first place, did they know what was the state of the country forty years ago, when the industry of the country was protected? There prevailed a state of degradation and misery which were a disgrace to the century and to the country,