

mented the mover and seconder for the manner in which they had discharged the duties that had been assigned to them. The hon. gentleman who moved the address is one who has for a long time occupied a position in the financial and industrial world and may be regarded as a very great acquisition to this Chamber, a gentleman who is familiar with the business of Canada to probably as great a degree as most of those who are in the Senate to-day. My hon. friend, the youngest senator in this Chamber, as he styles himself, perhaps also the youngest gentleman in the House, certainly acquitted himself in a most creditable manner. He gave promise that in the future he will prove a very valuable member. He comes from an aspiring city, Edmonton, which is growing at a very rapid pace, and promises to be a large centre of trade in the Northwest.

I am sorry that I cannot concur in any of the observations which were made by the other hon. gentlemen. I do not think that they did him credit, nor were they worthy of the address to the body in whose presence he spoke. He passed over the first paragraph or two of the address in which reference is made to the prosperity prevailing, in a very flippant manner, saying that Providence had to do with that and no credit could be attached to the government of the day for it. Well, it is a very trite remark that Providence helps those who help themselves. It does not appear that Providence helped my hon. friends very much from 1878 to 1896. During those years trade stagnated, notwithstanding the efforts made under the National Policy to galvanize it into life. In that whole period of time the aggregate trade of Canada advanced only \$67,000,000. The theory established by the National Policy was that the farmers were to sell to those employed by the manufacturers and the manufacturers were to grow rich by selling to the farmers. It was the old story of exchanging jack-knives. Foreign trade was not cultivated; no effort was made to establish it, and in consequence there was no progress made. Instead of population increasing, as hon. gentlemen know, year after year it rather diminished in many of the provinces. The exodus was a familiar topic of discussion every time parliament met during those

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

eighteen years. I will give just a few figures in illustration of what I am saying. I do not propose going into the subject at any length; it has been explained on many occasions before. The average annual increase in bank deposits between 1878 and 1896 was \$6,000,000. The average increase between 1896 and 1906 was \$34,000,000, nearly six times as large as when the National Policy prevailed. The aggregate trade increased annually only \$4,000,000 in the period when the hon. gentlemen were in power; the annual increase in the nine years up to the last returns we have officially was \$23,000,000. So that practically as far as bank deposits and the aggregate trade are concerned the difference is as six to one. Now, that is a marked difference. That did not come by accident or chance. It must have been the result of some strenuous effort on the part of the government. The sun shone as brightly during the years my hon. friend sat on this side of the House; the opportunities for the growth of the products of Canada were equally great, but they did not avail themselves of those opportunities. I could produce any amount of figures to sustain my statement, but I do not feel that it would be dealing fairly with the House to occupy its time with an off-told tale. It has been often given to this House before, and I think everybody is satisfied that it is to something more than the cause ascribed by the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition the extraordinary advance and development of the country during the relative periods to which I have adverted is due. The government spent money largely in their efforts to develop trade; they spent money lavishly to increase the growth of population. They had agents in the United States bringing before the people of that country the advantages that Canada offered, particularly to the farming element, and the investment met with a fair reward. In the same way all over Europe large amounts of money were spent by immigration agents to show the advantages of taking up land in Canada. I come now to the statement my hon. friend made in which he said: 'The Liberal party has been strangely inconsistent, and has shown little candour or honesty in masquerading as free traders for the last ten years. The govern-