

had before, and, in addition to that, and what is still more remarkable, they have every year increased the surplus which they send abroad, until, at the present time, it has reached the enormous sum of \$50,000,000 annually. There are no 537,000 people engaged in agricultural pursuits in any country in the world, that can show a better, or even as good a record of success and prosperity. It is little use, in the face of facts like these, for hon. gentlemen of the Opposition to talk about the decrease in the value of farm property. We know that farm property in the older provinces, in the agricultural districts, has decreased in value. But that is an experience which is common to every civilized country in the world. It is the inevitable result of having opened up large tracts of fertile land for settlement and having placed these on the markets at nominal cost, or absolutely free, to those who were willing to settle upon them. It is useless, too, for hon. gentlemen to base upon the so-called exodus of our population, and upon the fact that our population has not increased during the ten years covered by the census as rapidly as we might expect, in view of the number of immigrants landed on our shores, added to the natural increase of our population—to base upon these facts any argument to show that this country is not prosperous. If you wish to test the prosperity of the country, apply any of the tests which are recognized as the most reliable and most accurate by the best authorities in every civilized country in the world. Take the earnings of the people; take their savings deposited in the savings banks, in the chartered banks, in the insurance companies, in the loan and investment companies, and in other financial institutions; take the enormous increase of capital invested in agriculture, in manufactures, in building operations, in railway enterprises, in every class of commercial industry throughout the country; take the enormous increase in the purchasing power of our people, the higher standard of living and the higher standard of comfort among all classes; take the enormous increase in the trade we are doing with each other and with other nations; and take that which is the best test of all, the improved position of Canada in the great financial markets of the world. By any of these tests you choose to apply, there are no 5,000,000 people in any state or country, either in the old world or in the new, that can furnish as many and as convincing proofs of their growth in material prosperity as can the people of Canada since the adoption of the present fiscal policy in 1879. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House any further. There are a number of other questions which have been raised in this debate which it would be interesting to discuss. Many of them have been fully discussed

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).

already; others will be dealt with by those who are to follow. My principal object in addressing the House at all was to press upon the attention of hon. members the fallacy of the arguments which hon. gentlemen opposite have been advancing, based upon the southward movement of population, a movement which has been shown to be governed by climatic conditions merely, and which is influenced by no policy and can be controlled by no Government. I am sure that the financial statement which has been presented by the hon. Minister of Finance is satisfactory to this House, and will be satisfactory to the country. In any of the criticisms which have been offered in the course of this debate, I have not heard anything which should shake the confidence, either of the House or of the country, in the policy of the present Government, or in its administration of our public affairs; and I believe that no statement has been made since this Parliament opened will be received with more general satisfaction than the clear and explicit declaration of the Government, that the policy of the past is to be adhered to in the future.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### After Recess

Mr. McISAAC. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite profess to be very much concerned as to what is and what is not the policy of the Liberal party. Some of them assert that we have no policy at all, others say it is free trade as it exists in England, while all unite in saying that the policy propounded and agreed upon by the Liberals of Canada at their great convention a short time ago, is general, vague and indefinite in its terms. Sir, I think that any person who can read, and who will read that platform for himself, will at once come to the conclusion that it is not vague or general, but clear and definite as anything can be made by the English language. But if you want to know whether it is or whether it is not as clear as it should be, the very best possible way of ascertaining that is by way of comparison. I will ask you to come back some seventeen years in the history of this country, to the time when the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite introduced into this House the resolution upon which was based the National Policy of the Conservative party. I will read to you that resolution word for word; I will ask you to compare its words and meaning with the words and meaning of the platform of the Liberal party; and then I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite if the policy of the Liberal party, as laid down in their platform, is not more definite and clear in its terms than the National Policy resolution. Here it is: