

and that led them of their own motion to make inquiries respecting the products of this Dominion. What do we hear from shippers and merchants? To-day in the principal markets inquiries are made for Canadian goods; a trial is given them, and the result is seen in the widely increased exports to the English market. Let me give the House a statement of our exports to Great Britain during the first six months of the present fiscal year. We find that our exports, as compared with the corresponding period of the last fiscal year, increased by the large sum of \$22,500,888. That is our total exports for the six months over the corresponding six months of the last year. I think it is a fairer way to leave out the foreign products, and if we do so, we find that during those six months our home products exported to Great Britain show an increase of \$19,287,864 during the six months of the present over the corresponding six months of the previous year, which itself was a large year for exports. Where do I find the increases? Take the figures. Products of the fisheries, increase, \$82,864; products of the forest, increase, \$8,348,299; animals and their produce, increase, \$6,564,942; agricultural products, increase, \$8,640,184; manufactures, increase, \$782,759. The exports of produce of the mines to Great Britain decreased during the six months by \$108,648, and there was also a decrease in the exports of miscellaneous articles to the extent of \$22,216. Deducting these decreases, the increase in the other line of home products during the first six months of the present fiscal year over the corresponding six months of the previous year amounted to \$19,287,864. I desire to call attention to the fact that while our exports have shown an increase during those six months of nearly \$20,000,000 as compared with the corresponding six months of the previous year, the total imports into Great Britain during that time had decreased nearly \$90,000,000. Can anything speak louder for the position that Canada has taken in the British market even in the short space of time our tariff has been in operation?

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is very good preferential trade.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I had not intended to occupy the time of the House so long, but the reading of the tables took a longer time than I had anticipated. I have not attempted to deal with the financial part of the statement made by the Minister of Finance, and offer any criticism thereon, for the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his very fair and able criticism, gave an explanation and defence of the administration of this Government, which may disappoint some of our friends who may have anticipated that greater re-

sults would have been attained, but which will enable them to see clearly that the Government, so far as was consistent with the welfare and prosperity of the Dominion, have endeavoured, so far as in them lies, to economically carry on the administration of the finances of the country, while they are at the same time advancing its prosperity.

Mr. I VIN. What about sugar?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is just an element in the policy that has been introduced by this Government, that of binding together the colonies as well as the mother country. I would say to hon. gentlemen opposite that I have never claimed credit, nor has this Government ever claimed credit, that in our preferential trade as regards England or English colonies we have acted solely and alone to benefit the motherland or the colonies. We are looking after our own interests as well as developing the interests of the motherland. The reductions in our burdens give advantage to Canada, and the preference accorded to England is an advantage to her by Canada, and the same remark applies to the West Indies. What did the leader of the Opposition say with respect to the present sugar tariff? He declared we had adopted the right policy, that he had urged it upon us last year, that under the tariff as it existed our West Indian commerce had been destroyed. I was unable at the time to find or to remember where the hon. gentleman last year made that recommendation. He did not give us the time when he made it or the page where it could be found, and I am told by an hon. gentleman who has looked through "Hansard" that he failed in the hasty glance made at its pages to find the hon. gentleman's statement. I would be sorry to say that he did not make it, but he did not give the House the reference.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's colleague can tell him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman cannot now tell when he did it, because he did not do it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman did so, I will be willing to look it up in "Hansard." My memory wholly fails to recall it, if the hon. gentleman ever proposed anything such as we propose. I say I accept his word, but I have no remembrance of it. But if I accept his word, I ask him in what position he places the ex-Minister of Finance and the party who supported him. We left the sugar tariff last year on raw sugar as we found it left by the previous Government; and it is the question of raw sugar and not the refined that affects the West India trade.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend say