

the statement in the course of the speech made by the seconder of the address that we are to help the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is unusual to refer to private legislation in the Governor's Speech, and unless the government have some scheme by which they propose to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway by endorsing their paper, or guaranteeing their bonds, I do not know why the paragraph is introduced. We all remember the fight that took place by gentlemen in the House of Commons and also by gentlemen here against the Canadian Pacific Railway. I notice, however, that the Premier of Ontario, in a late address in Whitby, speaks highly of it, and, something unusual in the party to which he belongs, honestly admitted the error they made in opposing the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, admitting that Sir John Macdonald's policy, and which I admit was carried out at enormous expense, was the correct one, and redounds not only to his credit as a statesman, but has brought Canada to what she is to-day, and what she would not have been had not that road been built.

The reference to the inventor Marconi has no harm to it, but as the seconder of the address said—it is hard to say where he got his inspiration—I suppose it is the intention to subsidize Marconi that he may continue his experiments in Canada. We can all hope that his experiments may prove a success, and that they may be of benefit to this country.

The next paragraph refers to the revenue and expansion of business. That question was elaborately dealt with by the mover of the address. I am one of those who do not consider it to the greatest advantage, in a country like this, that our revenue should swell as it has swollen from importations. I would much rather see those goods which are imported, and from which we derive a revenue, made in Canada, giving employment to our artisans, our labourers, and our mechanics in order to keep them in the country, rather than have them go to the United States looking for employment. But has that been the result of what these gentlemen so often boast about, the introduction of what they call their preferential trade? I commend the figures to my hon. friend who has

moved the resolution, because it is evident that he has given attention to the importations, the exportations, and the great growth of the trade of the country. But when we are told that that is the result of a preferential tariff in favour of Great Britain neither facts nor the figures given us by the hon. Senator will sustain the statements made. Let us look at the figures and we find these facts: the aggregate increase of trade during the last year has been 48 per cent in favour of Great Britain, 80 per cent in favour of the United States, notwithstanding a preference given to the English manufacturer, to which I may refer more at length presently, France 101 per cent, Germany 40 per cent, Spain 101, Portugal 104, Italy 110, Holland 110, with Belgium it has increased 550 per cent over the former trade of that country. Now, how is it? Can any one explain how it is that the United States, lying close to us, with the thirty-three and a third per cent of a differential duty against her, increased her trade eighty per cent, while the trade of the favoured country which the preferential tariff was supposed to benefit, only increased forty-eight per cent? These are figures that all can verify by looking at the trade returns, and they can answer the question to their own satisfaction. If you take the percentage from 1896 to 1901 of the trade between the United States and Canada—I am not speaking now of the gross trade—you will find that in 1901 our percentage of trade with Great Britain was 31·15 per cent, and with the United States in 1896 it was 50·80 per cent. Hon. gentlemen will observe how in 1897 the trade fell off with England during the existence of this preferential tariff. In 1897 it fell down to 27·53 per cent, and the United States increased to 53·48 per cent. In 1898 England's trade decreased to 25·36 per cent, while the United States increased 29·24 per cent. In 1899 the percentage of trade with Great Britain was 24·72, and with the United States 59·24. The figures are precisely as they were the year before. In 1890 the trade with Great Britain had fallen off to 24·17, but in 1891, last year, England's trade fell to 24·10, while that of the United States increased to 60·30. There is the state of the figures, and when we are told that this preferential trade has done so much to cement the good feeling that exists