

go, they were about at a standstill. In 1892 they were \$22,000,000 and in 1893, they were \$22,000,000, so it will be seen that the additional amount of export was due entirely to the products of the forest and the products of animals. These are two sources of wealth to this country that are susceptible of the most extraordinary development. So far as the wealth of the forest goes, it depends entirely on whether our foreign customers can buy our lumber. When the United States or Great Britain are booming there is a greater demand for Canadian lumber; when there is any depression in the United States or Great Britain, but more particularly in the United States, the demand for lumber falls. The trade is not dependent on any innate factor in Canada, but on causes outside. So it is with animals—facility and cost of transport and incidents of that kind govern our ability to place them on the markets of the world as low as the producers of other countries are able to do. The growth of our trade is due entirely to the industry of the Canadian people. It is in no way dependent on the fiscal policy of the country. The fiscal policy is adverse to them. It bears heavily on the articles that they consume. There is no special credit to be claimed by the Government. Then, again, we are told that one gratifying phase of it is the increase of trade with Great Britain. I find the increase there is only about \$1,000,000 over the preceding year. The trade with Great Britain was \$106,000,000 in 1892, and in 1893 it was \$107,000,000; but a very singular coincidence is that 20 years ago it was \$107,000,000. Going back to 1873 it was exactly \$107,266,000, and in 1893 it was \$107,228,000, which is a few thousand dollars less than it was in 1873. Now that is not very much to boast of—nothing that can be held forth as evidence of great development in the trade of the country, when we have so many more broad acres under tillage, when we have so many more people engaged in agriculture, when we have so many more facilities for its transportation, and when we ought to be in a position to buy so much more than we did twenty years ago. Our trade with the United States last year was \$102,000,000, as against \$107,000,000 with Great Britain. It must be remembered that the British market is open to us. We can readily increase our aggregate trade with Great Britain by taking down our tariff. If we do, our trade will

certainly increase. The British market is always open to us. We do not pay a farthing on anything we send to that market, and therefore it rests entirely with ourselves to say whether our trade with Great Britain shall be increased or not. There is a constant reference to the advantages of the British market. I am most anxious to increase our trade with the British market, but to do so let us take down our tariff—that is the common sense way to do it. On their part there is no tariff barrier. The only wonder is that between the McKinley tariff on the one side and the Foster tariff on the other there is any trade between this country and the United States. What is surprising about it is that in spite of the difficulties created by both countries, we have \$102,000,000 trade with the United States, only \$5,000,000 less than with Great Britain. I may be told that that is due to some extent to the passage of bullion back and forth, but even allowing four or five millions of dollars for bullion, it shows an extraordinary expansion of trade with the United States in spite of all the difficulties and barriers thrown in the way. The hon. gentleman seemed to think, from the course of his remarks, that there was a degree of prosperity in Canada that we ought all to appreciate, and he did not seem to think that we were a highly taxed people or that we had anything to complain of with regard to the tariff. He comes from a part of the Dominion where nature has been most bountiful in her gifts—where they have not only the wealth of the land, rich soil for agriculture, but they have the wealth of the ocean around them. They have in addition to that an opportunity for recuperating the soil by gathering shells from the sea shore and enriching the land, yet Prince Edward Island has not made that progress which, under fair and ordinary conditions, from my standpoint, it should have made since it entered confederation. When I come to discuss the question of taxes, I think I will be able to show to the hon. gentleman that there are two ways of paying taxes—that the \$23,000,000 that we pay as customs duties and the \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 that we pay as inland revenue—or those who drink whisky and wine pay—represents a very small part of the taxes levied upon the people. Coming to Prince Edward Island I find that in 1874, the year after they came into confederation, they imported for consumption into the island \$1,900,000