

largely increased, still the expenses of management had been practically what they were under the previous board of directors; that the expenditure had been practically what it was before while the increase in revenue had been three and a half times greater, I want to know if that hon. gentleman would not expect a vote of thanks from the shareholders of the company. The present government, I think, have received from the people of Canada a vote of thanks at the last general elections for the way they had administered the finances of this country during the previous four years.

Some members from the great province of Ontario have asked what this government have done for the farmers, what they have done to find better markets for the produce of this country. Now, Sir, allow me to read some figures which will show what has been done under the present administration for the farmers of this country:

EXPORTS.

| | 1896. | 1900. |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Butter | \$ 1,052,089 | \$ 5,122,156 |
| Cheese | 13,956,871 | 19,856,324 |
| Eggs | 807,086 | 1,457,902 |
| Bacon and hams..... | 4,381,968 | 12,758,025 |
| Animals and their produce (total) | 36,507,641 | 56,148,807 |
| Apples | 1,416,470 | 2,578,233 |
| Fruits | 1,716,278 | 3,305,662 |
| Wheat | 5,771,521 | 11,995,488 |
| Flour | 718,433 | 2,791,885 |
| Total grain | 8,096,808 | 18,057,233 |
| Agricultural products .. | 14,083,361 | 27,516,609 |
| Total provisions | 21,200,808 | 40,063,218 |
| Manufactures | 9,365,384 | 14,224,287 |
| Exports the produce of Canada | 109,915,337 | 170,642,369 |

In regard to apples, the hon. member for Wentworth said that for ten or fifteen years past the apple growers of Ontario had been trying to get the government to do something for the apple export trade, and they could get nothing until they applied to the present Minister of Agriculture, who was the first to try to do anything for the apple exporters of Ontario. The statement which I have given is my answer to the hon. gentlemen who have asked on some former occasions what the present government have done for the manufacturers and producers of Canada in order to obtain and develop markets for them.

Now, in regard to preferential trade matters about which we have heard a great deal and about which a great deal was said during the last election, it appears, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is a very easy matter to get the British government to put a duty on corn, meat and other products of large importation into that country. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) in speaking upon this question the other evening, pretended to think that it was an easy matter to have this thing settled. In a very short space of time he fixed up a tariff, that, to his mind, would not only suit Canada but Great Britain

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.)

and the other parts of the British Empire. He fixed this matter up, settled it to his own satisfaction and he then, in fancy, took a trip to the commonwealth of Australia. He arranged matters there for the commonwealth of Australia and then, having some more work to do he transported himself, in fancy, to the old country and showed the effete statesmen of that country what they needed for the mother land. He told them that it was a very easy matter to put a duty on corn and other foodstuffs going into that country, because, as he said, this duty would not increase the price to the consumer in Great Britain, but that at the same time it would increase the price of these articles to the producers in Canada. I have heard that the magicians of old were men that could do wonderful things, but I do not believe they could do anything so wonderful as that which the hon. member for West York proposes when he says that Great Britain could put a duty on articles from Canada going into that country that would not increase the price, but which at the same time would give the producers in Canada an increased price. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), not to be outdone in anything that was going on, rose in his place and showed that he had a goat of his own that he was going to ride or die in the attempt. He became severe with some of the bad men who were preventing him from buying the railway systems and steamship lines for \$2, and he was going to show the people how they could be made rich by taxing themselves. In order to show how easy he could explain all these matters he threw off a few ideas of abstract wisdom, and in winding up the matter he said that the United States, a highly protective country, are driving free trade England out of the markets of the world in the manufacture of iron and steel. He drew from that the conclusion that it was because of protection that the United States were enabled to manufacture iron and steel cheaper than free trade England. Did it not strike that hon. gentleman that if the United States were able to manufacture these metals cheaper than England it was because of their great natural advantages? Canada is not a highly protective country as compared with the United States, and we have heard upon the highest authority that Canada can manufacture iron and steel for \$6 a ton less than the United States. It would appear to me that if the hon. member for East York had taken the trouble to examine this question he would not have said that it was because of the protection that the United States have given these industries that they have achieved such great results but that it is because of the great natural advantages that they can manufacture cheaper. For the very same reason Canada can manufacture these articles cheaper. But, the hon. member for East York was going to make another arrangement. He is