

and, to prove his statement, read an extract from a proclamation issued by that society. I will read that extract from the proclamation, to show to what lengths the hon. gentleman would go to sustain an assertion :

"The time has come for this Province to address the Sovereign, with the explicit declaration that unless relief be obtained separation from the Empire and the independence of the North American colonies will be desirable."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not a word about annexation.

Mr. HACKETT. Yet the hon. gentleman said the Finance Minister was treasurer of an annexationist society. I consider it unworthy the hon. gentleman, holding a front position, as he does, in the ranks of his party, to so distort facts as to make black appear white and white black. As the hon. gentleman has entered into the question of loyalty, I hope he will pardon me if I read a portion of a remarkable speech which he delivered in 1880, not prior to but since Confederation. At that time the question of the ratification of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was before this House. The hon. gentleman called a meeting of the electors of Queen's county, P. E. I.; the meeting was held in the market hall at Charlottetown; and in the course of a very long and able speech he uttered the following sentiments:—

"We are now asked to consent to a contract which will seal up that great country and hand it over to a monopoly, a contract which will be an iron hand upon the neck of every young man who goes there as a tiller of the soil, a contract from which there is no escape, politically or commercially, excepting one, and that is annexation to the United States. It is an escape which no politician likes to talk about, but it will come one day, and when it comes we must take our chance and make the best bargain we can."

The hon. gentleman, as an American statesman would say, considered annexation to be the manifest destiny of Canada. He would make it appear that, rightly or wrongly, we should be annexed to the United States. The hon. gentleman, before he charges others with disloyalty, should consider his own utterances. I see behind him the descendants of some of the loyalists who left the United States after the close of the revolutionary war, leaving all their property behind them, going to the then sterile and inhospitable shores of Canada to gain a livelihood for themselves and their families. I would commend the hon. gentleman to their care; and if they do not prosecute him for his seditious language, I hope, at any rate, they will not associate with him. The hon. gentleman went on to take up the question of the exodus, which appears to be a live question at the present time. Referring to the remark of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) that he did not believe that there was any such exodus from the country as was pictured by the hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. gentleman said :

"He says that proclaiming that there is such a thing as an exodus to the United States is calculated to injure the country, and that it should not be stated, though it is the truth. A truce to sentiment, let us have facts. What are the facts? It is a fact contained in the census report, a fact well known to the hon. gentleman, a fact which he could not shut his eyes to, a fact which he has heard repeated and has never heard challenged in this House, that in the United States there are 712,000 Canadians to-day, and yet he says there is no exodus."

That may be very correct, but I want to show you, Sir, why an exodus has taken place from this country. One of the chief causes is the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, the mournful wail they raise on all questions connected with Canada, the terrible pictures they draw of the dire distress of our people—all which have had the effect of driving out of the country very many people. They became discontented. They said: It is surely a good country to emigrate from; it would be dangerous to remain in it much longer, and those who had means to go were induced to go, by the terrible pictures of distress drawn by hon. gentlemen opposite. Amongst those who encouraged this exodus, to a large extent, figure the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies)

Mr. HACKETT.

In that remarkable speech which he delivered at Charlottetown, he had also something to say with regard to the exodus, and the bad effects the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have on emigration to Canada. In very emphatic language he depicted the miseries of the people of Ireland, who, he said, were suffering under the iron hand of the landlord, and who were compelled to seek refuge in America. And he said :

"If they come here and the contract becomes law, they will simply jump from the frying pan into the fire"—

Is not that a noble sentiment? Is not that calculated to encourage immigration?

"As the great North-West will be entirely into the hands of the most powerful of landlords, are emigrants fools enough to go there? No, they will go to the American Republic, where they will have freedom."

These were the utterances of the hon. gentleman on that occasion, and I quite believe they are calculated to have a very great effect in dissuading immigrants from coming to the shores of Canada. Although we know hon. gentlemen opposite are very much in the habit of going on in this style, we sometimes find in their ranks people who will rise above party considerations and give utterance to patriotic sentiments. In Summerside, the shire town of the country I have the honor to represent, the *Summerside Pioneer*, a newspaper edited by a gentleman who supports the Opposition and who is a very respectable man, whom I am glad to know, rises on occasion above party feeling and gives utterance to live sentiments. In November, 1883, the *Summerside Pioneer* stated as follows, with regard to the exodus:—

"It may be well enough for young persons who have no means of making a living to try their fortune elsewhere; but we consider it a mistake for those who are moderately well off to rush after imaginary wealth."

He goes on to say—I would ask my hon. friend to give particular attention to what he says :

"There are always croakers in every community, who make a business of crying down the place in which they live, and this Province has its full share of such people. Persons of that stamp would turn the Garden of Eden into a frog pond, with a green scum on its surface. It is no wonder that our young people, growing up with the steady wail of discontent in their ears, should seek other fields on being able to leave the parental nest."

I think the editor of the *Summerside Pioneer*, supporter, as he is, of the hon. gentlemen opposite, very aptly described the effect of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite, not only in this House but in the country. It would appear that when the hon. gentleman referred to the 712,000 Canadians at present in the United States, he would make out that they all went there since the inauguration of the National Policy; that all these people were driven out of Canada through the effects of that policy, and were obliged to seek a home in the United States. Let us look into that statement. In 1870, according to the United States census, 490,000 people, natives of Canada, were in the United States. That was before the introduction of the National Policy. In 1880, only one year after the National Policy became the law of the country, we find 712,000 native Canadians in the United States, the exact number cited by the hon. gentleman, so that if you take the decade from 1870 to 1880 and add the death rate, which, according to a very elaborate calculation of the leader of the Opposition, made last year, would amount to 21 per cent., we find that the total number of Canadians who went into the United States during that decade would be 345,000, or about 34,000 a year. Thus only 34,500 of the 712,000 left the country under the National Policy. Still the hon. gentleman would make it appear, and he sends his speeches broadcast through the country, that 712,000 people were driven out of Canada through the effects of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman went on to refer to the great progress