

conditions were practically the same as they have been within the last ten years since we on this side came into power, the condition of the whole country was stagnant. What then is the great reason for the tremendous progress the country has made since this administration has been in office? During the last ten years of Conservative rule, the country was not only at a standstill but in some regards going back. To-day on the contrary our progress is so remarkable that no one can fail noticing it. To-day our country is booming and prosperous. Why is that the case?

Why was this standstill? Simply because the government of that day had not the wisdom, had not the foresight, had not the ability, to grapple with the situation. No other conclusion can be arrived at. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) gave an explanation the other night, and there is no harm in my repeating it. He said that hon. gentlemen opposite were simply incapable of understanding the effect of their own acts. The conditions which existed in that western country then were far different from those of recent years. I lived in that western country for eighteen long years under Conservative rule—I might say eighteen long years of a government of incapables, of men who were not alive to the situation. And the country came to a standstill. In fact it used to be said that here in the east the country was not even standing still, but was moving in the wrong direction. Our Conservative friends used to talk about the smoking chimneys that we were to see in this broad land under their rule. But, during the later part of their regime, many of the chimneys that had been smoking ceased to smoke. And many chimneys that had been promised were never built. Many of those who invested their money in different undertakings in Canada, owing to lack of capacity somewhere, failed. These are the conditions that we were up against during the later years of Conservative management. But, as I said, what do we find to-day? Everything is in a prosperous condition, the chimneys of the country are all smoking, the factories of the country are running night and day; and many of them, I fancy, running on Sunday as well; we know as a matter of fact that the railways of this country operate on Sunday and that they would be incapable of handling their business otherwise. The demand for goods of various kinds is so great that every factory in the country is overloaded with orders. I know that in some lines the factories of Canada cannot begin to supply the demand. I know whereof I speak when I say that, so far as certain lines are concerned, if it were not that we are able to draw from the country to the south of us, this year's crop in the west would have not been seeded, because there were not implements enough manufactured in eastern Canada to supply

Mr. CRAWFORD.

the demand of that country. And I venture to say further, that unless we draw harvesting machinery from across the line in time for this crop—assuming that nothing serious happens to it during the growing season—the crop cannot be harvested. These are the conditions in the country to-day. What has brought about the change. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard of the Siftonian immigration policy. I claim that Mr. Sifton's immigration policy has done more to bring these conditions about than any other thing that has been done, that, in fact, it is practically responsible for the great progress of this country and the great change in our conditions. This I say, no matter what the opposition may think can account for it. The agencies which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has employed have done more to open up and develop that western country, which is the backbone of Canadian progress, than anything else.

So, the only question to be considered is: Have we been paying too much for our immigration? To ask that question is to answer it. I do not see how there can be two opinions about it. No member of this House, so far as I know, has even attempted to prove that our immigration has cost us too much. If this fact indicates the general opinion of the House, I cannot see how there can be very much wrong. Why, then, this criticism that we hear? What is the matter with the opposition? My conclusion is that our friends opposite are so disappointed, so jealous, so miserably narrow in their jealousy, of the leader of this government that they are prepared to resort to any means, no matter how unfair, no matter how small, to injure the Liberal party, regardless of the results to the country. I would ask, not the House particularly, but the country, to size up a government formed of members of the opposition at the present time, and consider what such a government might mean to this Dominion. We had eighteen years practically under the same management as we might expect to get now, and, as I have shown, they were eighteen most disastrous years to the west and to the whole country.

This brings us to this North Atlantic Trading Company question. Now, what is wrong in our dealings as a country with that company? We have a straight business proposition, a proposition that any person can understand, a proposition as simple as A B C. We are not paying for something in the dark, we are paying for immigrants, selected immigrants, that we receive. And what need we care if some of our friends should profit more or less by it? For my part, so long as nothing crooked is done, I do not care—in fact, I would rather see my friends profit a little than anybody else.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.