

American people, if they would only furnish the financial assistance requisite to enable his party to carry out that policy :

Mr. Carnegie and his friends were not satisfied with this limited programme, they were advised to drop the whole matter, as any fund sent to the guerilla wing of the Liberal party would be simply wasted and misapplied. Messrs. Carnegie and Dana then drew out of the movement. Their friends followed suit, and the international alliance came to an end.

What is the case ? They are without funds to-day. I only give this as an evidence to show that the very men who were talking about the Government providing funds to run an election were supplied with funds by Mr. Wiman—undoubtedly the evidence is conclusive—for the last campaign, and they are in hopes of being supplied with funds for the next campaign by the annexationists on the other side, who are moving resolutions and showing their willingness to raise the funds, if the money be only put into the hands of reliable parties. They have put at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite \$50,000, and are prepared to go on and raise sufficient means to enable them to carry on the party warfare.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman tells us there are \$50,000 deposited. I want to know where it is.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). He did not say deposited.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that the information disclosed in this correspondence from Washington to a Buffalo paper is that \$50,000 was raised and at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that the annexationists on the other side would raise much more if hon. gentlemen opposite could only prove their bona fides, and that the money would be put into the hands of responsible parties who would use it in the interests of annexation. I did not say deposited. Then we had a speech from the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), and I was very much amused at the line of criticism that hon. gentleman indulged in. As I looked at that hon. gentleman and remembered the man whose place he has come to fill, the exclamation of the poet was recalled to my mind : " Shades of the mighty dead, what calamities befall a nation ! " Think of the great man, the noble character who preceded him, and whose untimely death in the house of his Sovereign, at the very moment when he was receiving the highest tribute which could be paid to a colonial statesman for his integrity to the Empire, think of his good work and his great ability, and of his untimely end which drew forth the sympathies, not only of the Dominion, but of the united Empire—think of that great man, and how dwarfed must not his successor appear. The country has to bear not only the calamity of this great loss, but the spectacle of the vacant

place being filled by the hon. gentleman who regaled our ears with the flow of speech we had to listen to last night. Compare the calm dignity, the clear and cautious presentation, the logical reasoning, the matured judgment, the legal acumen, the plain and candid advice of the late member for Antigonish (Sir John Thompson) with the turgid, uninteresting stream of invective, windy declamation, and morbid imagery to which this House was treated last night by his successor, the present member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). " Oh, what a falling off was there ! " There was in the hon. gentleman's whole speech, no evidence either of logic or reasoning, or calmness, or dignity, or ability, and it is not to be wondered at that the country should lament the change. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) should say nothing about corruption or dishonesty. It does not lie in his mouth to speak of it so glibly as he has done. What does the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford mean to the Canadian people ? It announces to the Canadian people—if you return us to power we are going to give you, if we can be believed, free trade as they have it in England. It means to the manufacturer that Canada will be again made a slaughter market for American goods, as it was in 1878. It means to the mechanic and labourer reduced work because of the reduced output of the factories, reduced wages and a reduced supply of the necessaries of life. It means to the farmer the destruction of his home market by the competition of western farmers—by Armour and Company of Chicago ; by Swift of Chicago ; by those men who injured us so very much in the past. But we are told by the hon. member for North Norfolk that protection is of no use to the Canadian farmer. It is against his interest that grain is not allowed to come in free ; the duty on pork was of no advantage to the Canadian farmer. And the hon. gentleman says : If the country returns our party to power, we will do away with that protection and will bring the people of Canada back to the condition in which they were in 1878. Let me give one item in which the Canadian farmer is interested, and which, to my mind, proves most conclusively that the theory of the hon. member for North Norfolk is entirely foundationless. I find by the returns that in one year Armour, Swift and other similar houses sent into Canada to feed Canadians 29,000,000 pounds of meat, fresh and salted. Then a protective policy was brought into play and a duty was put upon meat. The result was that last year these firms brought into Canada only 8,000,000 pounds of meat. That is to say, 21,000,000 of meat was shut out. How many Canadians would that feed ? What increased market would that mean to the Canadian farmer ? Would not that market be taken away from him if we did away with the protective tariff that shuts