

It is true that the member for South Huron also appears to be leaning towards independence, while the leader of the Opposition has pronounced in favor of Imperial federation. This is a new proof that the Liberal party has no unanimity, has no acceptable programme. In that same speech which I have just quoted, the member for East Quebec said that since the *coup d'état* had been condemned, the Conservative party in his Province was a mere plaything in the hands of Sir John. Even yesterday I heard the hon. member for South Huron telling us that he was in favor of the maintenance of a truly national spirit. And yet this same hon. member said at Napanee, in 1883, that the people of Upper Canada ought to form a league, as they did twenty years ago, to put down what he called French domination. Thus, while we see, on the one hand, the member for East Quebec preaching that the Lower Canada Conservatives were only puppets in the hands of the First Minister, on the other hand we see the leader of the Opposition complaining that the Province of Quebec rules with absolute power over the whole country. Mr. Speaker, the people seeing that, on the one hand, the Liberal party has no well-defined programme, and that what programme they do have is unacceptable in many respects; seeing that, on the other hand, the Conservative party has a policy which is based on the protection of our great agricultural and industrial interests, a policy based on the development and construction of the great works which are indispensable to the prosperity of the country, the people of Canada, I do not hesitate to say, will continue their confidence in the Conservative party, who have done so much to deserve it.

Mr. HACKETT. I think the House and the country are to be congratulated on the very able and satisfactory statement made by the Finance Minister. It must be gratifying to the people of Canada to know that the financial affairs of the country are in a very satisfactory condition. For the last year or so hon. gentlemen opposite have been going about endeavoring by every means in their power to decry the credit of Canada. They have stated on almost every platform, and their press has repeated the statement, that the people were leaving the country in large numbers, that taxation was rolling up at a fearful rate, and that the debt of the country was something enormous. Now, we are glad to know from the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance that these assertions are quite unwarranted, but that the credit of Canada as a borrowing country stands high in the money market of the world—that in fact our securities occupy a front rank. We are also glad to know that notwithstanding that large amounts of money have been appropriated for public improvements, the debt per head of the population is less than that of a great many other countries, and not so great as that of other countries on this continent. What is the reason, Sir, that things are in so satisfactory a condition? In my opinion, we must attribute it to the beneficial working of the National Policy. Those of us who were in this House in 1879, when the policy was inaugurated, will remember the vicious opposition that that policy met with from hon. gentlemen opposite. We then saw these hon. gentlemen rise, one after another, and assert, in the most confident language, that this policy was going to ruin the country, that it would be the means of creating vast monopolies, and that the consumers of the country would be ground down under the iron heel of those monopolies. Again, in 1882, when the Government appealed to the people for a confirmation of this policy, we had to meet the same arguments. We were told that great cotton lords and great sugar lords existed in the country, and that these men, after making fortunes out of the poor people of the country, in a few years, were in London, Paris, Rome and other cities of the old world, spending their money lavishly. But two or three years later we have

a different story told on the floor of this House. We are now told that these men are all ruined, and that the capital they have invested has all been lost. We know that depression does exist; but this fact we have to comfort us: that the consumers of the country are buying the articles required by them for the support of themselves and their families at a cheaper rate than has ever before been known in this country. This is the result of the National Policy, and this I consider is very satisfactory to the people. Now, Sir, without entering into the abstract question of the National Policy, I may say that my object in rising on this occasion is to correct some errors that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) made on the occasion he addressed the House a few evenings ago. That hon. gentleman on that occasion made a very remarkable speech—remarkable for its inaccuracies, remarkable for the way in which he compared our country with the countries of the world, by distorting facts and figures to show that Canada occupied a very poor position as compared with other countries. I am glad to say, however, that the hon. gentleman directed his remarks principally to the Dominion of Canada as a whole. Some two or three years ago, when the hon. gentleman took his seat in this House for the first time, speaking of the financial condition of the country, he singled out Prince Edward Island as being especially ground down by the National Policy. He told us on that occasion how the people were being driven out of Prince Edward Island, how whole rows of houses were to let, how the wharves were deserted, how no business was doing, how everything was so depressed and demoralised that men having money were afraid to invest it, and how the greatest ruin prevailed in that Province. I admonished the hon. gentleman on that occasion that he was doing a great wrong in decrying his Province, and that his remarks would have a bad effect upon its credit. I am glad that since then he has learned wisdom, and that my admonition has had a good effect; because in addressing the House now he does not confine himself to Prince Edward Island, but speaks of the whole Dominion. The hon. gentleman, at the commencement of his remarks, treated us to a little dissertation on loyalty. It was called out by some remarks made by the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), to the effect that there was no respectable gentleman at present in the Liberal-Conservative party, or no respectable newspaper in the country, advocating annexation to the United States. The hon. member for King's made that statement, and I believe it to be correct. He stated, further, that there was a paper, he believed the only one in the Maritime Provinces, advocating annexation, published in the city of St. John, and edited by a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Queen's, in reply to that statement, singled out something that had been said long years ago, long before the Provinces were united in a Confederation. He singled out some remarks made by the hon. Minister of the Interior, I believe, and other gentlemen occupying high positions in the country; he also referred to some remarks made by Mr. Beaudry, of Montreal. With all this, I do not see what we in Canada, at the present time, have to do. We know that before Confederation the North American Provinces had separate tariffs and separate forms of Government, one not amenable in any way to another. We know the struggles that men had to undergo in those times to gain the privileges we now enjoy. We know that it was only after fearful struggles that responsible Government was obtained in this country. And it is an honor to the men who were then ruling this country that they stood up and declared: We will have our rights, or go for separation from Great Britain, and for the independence of the North American colonies. Amongst other gentlemen, he singled out the Minister of Finance. He wanted to prove that the Minister of Finance was an annexationist. He said he was the treasurer and secretary of an annexationist society;