

ing classes at all, to any appreciable extent. They are the moneys belonging to trustees, to well-to-do farmers and others, to lawyers and those kinds of people. We know that the laboring classes do not, to any appreciable extent, deposit in them."

I do not think the hon. gentleman is correct—I am quite sure he is not correct. I saw a statement the other day made, that the largest proportion of the deposits in the post office saving banks of the country is made by the working classes, and that the merchants and capitalists are to no great extent depositors in those banks. I presume the hon. gentleman will not be satisfied with my version of the story, so I will give him the highest authority that, in the estimation of the hon. gentleman, can possibly be given. I will give the hon. gentleman himself. Last year that hon. member, in this House, was advocating the establishment of savings banks in Prince Edward Island, more especially at Summerside, which I represent. The hon. member was not aware, at that time, that a savings bank had been established there about a year before. I had no idea of informing him of the fact; I thought it better to leave him in blissful ignorance of it. That bank was established a year before the hon. gentleman spoke, and at that very moment there were in the vaults \$100,000 of the savings of the people of Prince county, of the farmers, fishermen and mechanics, and not of money belonging to merchants, traders or manufacturers. But the hon. gentleman, in his zeal for savings banks, made an interesting statement on that occasion. He said:

"The object of these banks is to enable small farmers and laborers to deposit their savings in them."

The hon. gentleman made a very different statement here to-day. I am quite willing to take the statement last year and place it against the statement this year and leave the House and the country to judge between them. But the hon. gentleman also made a reference to the fact that shortly before the famine in Ireland very large accumulations were made in the savings banks. I think that was a very unfortunate reference to an unfortunate circumstance. There is no country in the world which he could have used to worse advantage in illustrating his case than that of Ireland. If any country affords an example of the curse of free trade it is Ireland. Free trade has killed Ireland. There was a time when the manufactures of Ireland were found in the markets of Europe and even of the United States. There was a time when Irish linen, poplin and frieze and woollen goods generally were to be found all over the world. But it is not so to-day, under the influence of free trade. When England's manufactures had been established under a system of protection the embargo was removed from Ireland; direct importations were not allowed to Ireland, but goods for Ireland had to be discharged at English ports; after having the capital drawn from Ireland to assist in the development of English industries, the protective tariff was removed and free trade was established, and the result is that the people of Ireland are not in a position to embark in industrial enterprise, but are dependent on the cultivation of the soil for their support. That is how we find that free trade has destroyed Ireland, so that the people have to depend principally on the potato for their living, having no industry outside of the farm to engage in; that the population are idle about nine months in the year, and that when the potato fails there is famine. Had Ireland the opportunity afforded under protection, manufacturing industries would be established. She possesses great water power and valuable mines, and under a fostering tariff manufactures would, in a short time, be established. We know that the people of Ireland were very much troubled when they found that free trade was adopted in England. I find the following queries sent by an English correspondent to the *Nation* newspaper, one of the most influential and ably-conducted journals published in Ireland:

"Q. Is there an entirely free trade between Ireland and England or between Ireland and all colonial ports?"

"A. Yes; quite too free. Your Legislature kept up commercial restrictions only till Irish trade and commerce were finally crushed and the capital which ought to have sustained them effectually secured to England. Then, when the current of trade was established—Irish raw produce to England, English manufactures to Ireland—you offered us free trade. It is not more free trade, but less free trade that Ireland wants now.

"Q. Are there any obstructions to Irish commerce, trade or manufactures, which do not exist with regard to the same in England.

"A. Not now; having stripped us bare and secured the markets of the world to yourselves, you can now afford to say to Ireland: What hinders you from rivalling us? Up, and be stirring. Behold your trade is free."

We know the position of Canada, lying as it does alongside the United States, is similar to that of Ireland to England. We know that they are more favorably situated in Ireland than we are in Canada, because while we allowed American manufactures to come in here at low rates of duty, they built up a wall and kept our manufactures and raw products from the markets of their country. The manufactures of Ireland have free access to the markets of England while we are deprived, as I have said, of the markets of the United States. As a means of self-defence and self-support it became the interest of the Canadian people that we should adopt in a large measure the same kind of policy as prevails in the United States. There is a small book which I see largely distributed through the House—the report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the condition of our manufacturing interests. That report has received very severe criticism at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. I wondered why that book of all books had received such sharp criticism at their hands, but on opening it I at once saw the reason. It showed that there are manufactures in the country, and that although a certain amount of depression does exist, yet they are in a fairly prosperous condition; and for this reason hon. gentlemen opposite criticised it most adversely.—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it correct?

Mr. HACKETT. In some respects. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) also criticised the book; but he dealt with it very gingerly, and at length threw it down with a sneer. He said it referred to the lobster industry; and he asked: What has the National Policy done for that industry? I am going to inform him. We know that since we have adopted the National Policy we have had sufficient revenue to meet expenditure and had a surplus. As I have had the honor of a seat in this House since 1879, I know that deputations waited on the Finance Minister for the purpose of taking 5 per cent. duty off tin plates, and thus relieve the lobster packers of a certain amount of taxation. For tin is not manufactured in this country, but is brought from England, and this duty of 5 per cent. was a direct tax on the lobster packers and the people of the country. Owing to the operation of the National Policy the hon. gentleman has been able to relieve the packers of that duty, and he has also been able to reduce for them the duty on other material; and, in addition to that, for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the fishing industry of the country, owing to the National Policy they are able to pay the fishermen—a most deserving class—a bounty of \$150,000 a year. I do not know that I need follow the hon. gentleman to any greater extent, but I want to say a word with respect to reciprocity. Coming from Prince Edward Island, I know that reciprocity of trade with the United States would be of great advantage to the people of that island. We feel there that the markets of the United States are the only ones available for one of the main products of the island—potatoes. If we had reciprocity the farmers of the island might go to raising and exporting them largely, but at present they are debarred from that privilege. The imposition of a duty of 15 cents a bushel has been sufficient to shut them out of the American market. And while a great deal has been said with regard to