

better position than that of any other country of the world. Although our position is one of great difficulty, nevertheless this is the situation. Exports for last March are the highest we have had this year, namely, over \$41,000,000. March exports of newsprint showed an increase of 580,000 hundredweight over February. It is true the price is low. March imports of raw material, including cotton, have increased by nearly 3,000,000 pounds over the figures for February last year, a gain of 22 per cent. Our exports to Great Britain show remarkable increases in some directions over March of 1931, as follows: fruits from \$99,000 to \$282,000; barley from \$13,000 to \$111,000; sugar from \$5,000 to \$9,000, whiskey from nil to \$1,000; cheese from \$44,000 to \$86,000; furs from \$708,000 to \$742,000, unmanufactured leather from \$143,000 to \$172,000; meats from \$143,000 to \$358,000; fibres and textile products from \$77,000 to \$108,000; cotton from \$9,000 to \$35,000 and so on.

Prices of silver have risen and we have increased our exports of that commodity. Our export of nickel has increased. The production of copper has increased from 19,675,016 pounds in January to 22,428,571 pounds in February; blister copper from 15,971,151 pounds in January to 17,376,689 pounds in February, and lead from 19,048,424 pounds in February, 1931, to 20,154,613 pounds in February, 1932.

We have made corresponding increases in other exports. That indicates only one thing, not that we have yet entered upon that prosperity which is our due, but that we are showing signs of recovery from world conditions and that those signs are even more marked in this country than they are in most countries to which we could refer. The significance of this is found in an article in one of the leading western papers in which three or four stocks were taken and the price lists given showed that they had shrunk even more than had other commodities, if you will, during the same period. I do not propose to say more on that phase of the discussion that has taken place in the house. I have endeavoured to indicate why the actions taken have been taken. They have not been taken by accident; they have been taken deliberately; they have been taken not for the purpose, as has been suggested, of showing how high a tariff may be made, but with one design, and that I have already indicated.

The only other important point to which I think I might direct attention is the observation made by the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth as to the sale of our con-

version securities. I think it is unfair that that matter should remain upon the record without some reference being made to it. He made the statement that the sale of those securities at the high rate that prevailed when the national service loan was carried out this fall was at too high a rate and it was very hard upon those who accepted conversion securities a year ago. A year ago the hon. gentleman made a speech and this is what he said:

It is not a remarkable financing operation, then, for the people of this country to be induced to take the premier securities of this dominion at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. We are glad that it has been successful, but I wish to say in all frankness that in my opinion and judging by other public financing the rate which was paid and the terms on which the loan was made were exceedingly generous, if not high, so far as those who got those bonds are concerned.

So that the leading financial critic of the opposition thought the four and a half per cent conversion rate was somewhat too high. The matter is very simple: four and a half per cent for long-term securities is regarded as a reasonable rate and was so regarded. The people made the conversion, the exchange because they believed it was a sound business thing to do. Just as in other countries the same conditions brought about the same results; if they were generous in their response it was because of their courage and faith in their own country. Now we are told, because their securities have shrunk in value as compared with present day values, the government has been guilty of bad faith, because the same hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth said:

I think the people have a right to complain of this financing and to say that perhaps too much credit is not due to the Prime Minister in connection therewith. My hon. friends may applaud if they wish but I submit that it would have been only justice to the people of Canada had the Minister of Finance paid to them the tribute which was due and acknowledged the part which they took when they turned in their bonds for the conversion loan. These people accepted a loss and that loss has continued to grow as the months go on. I know quite well the difference between the prices of long term bonds and short term bonds, and I realize that the national service loan and the conversion loan were two entirely different things. I do not think the right hon. minister can give too much credit to the investors of Canada for their having put through the conversion loan.

We have given them credit, Mr. Speaker, for so doing; for it of course was the proper thing, and when you find that United States securities have fallen on the market by ten points I think it will be admitted that the maintenance of prices in this country has