

000 worth of goods from Great Britain, over \$11,000,000 of which were entered as free goods. For the balance, they had the benefit of the 33½ per cent. Now, that is a very considerable advantage to them, that on an invoice of goods, where the duty would be \$300 as against all other countries, the British preference gave them the right to enter the goods by paying \$200 on that single consignment. There was a profit of \$100, and that certainly was going a long way. I presume the reason we have not bought more largely there, is that our own industries have been stimulated of late years. Money has been made in Canada, and invested in industries which are more flourishing than under what was called the national policy. We have heard nothing but a recognition of Canada's action by the British people. They have never complained. They have taken it as an evidence of our good feeling, and we have benefited by the sentiment that that has created—the sentiment of a nation is very much better than its laws—and if the British people have formed that opinion of Canada that they owed us some degree of gratitude for our action, then they bought from us more goods, and the figures and facts will prove that. Now, I will just take the exports to Great Britain. The figures are rather startling, and they cannot be contradicted. The exports in 1878, were \$45,000,000; in 1896, \$66,000,000. That is, the increase in our sales to the people of Great Britain had gone up only a little over \$1,000,000 a year. Now, from 1896 to 1901, the increase in the five years has been \$39,000,000, so that hon. gentlemen will see that while the increase in eighteen years prior to 1897 was only nineteen millions, the increase in five years was thirty-nine millions—nearly double in the five years. There must have been something to have created that. It was not natural growth. Why did it start in 1897 and jump in one year to twelve million dollars, and so on, until last year it was one hundred and five millions? The sun was shining as brightly during the eighteen years of the national policy. The rain fell as liberally. There were as good crops, and cattle were produced all over the country and why was it that in all that time there was such a very small increase, only a little over a million dollars a year? Something must have happened to have

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

suddenly made the whole jump in this way. The figures are worth remembering and I do not think they can be explained otherwise than in the manner I have indicated, by showing that the British people took more interest in Canada, and bought more liberally of Canadian products. It is quite true, probably, that we have improved transportation, stimulated by the cold storage, and we have educated the people how to send their goods abroad. No doubt that was done, but even with that it must be admitted that the extraordinary increase in the sales to the British people are otherwise inexplicable—in eighteen years the increase was only nineteen millions, and in five years it was thirty-nine millions. It had jumped from sixty-six millions in 1897 to one hundred and five millions in 1901.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—The argument is that this is all due to the preferential tariff?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes. Can my hon. friend explain it in any other way than that the British people did not, before that, take as great an interest in Canadian products? How was it that the moment the preferential tariff was passed this extraordinary increase in the demand for Canadian goods arose? Will my hon. friend explain it away by some theory that I have not yet heard announced? I know of no other way of explaining it.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I would think that good crops had something to do with it.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Did Providence blight the harvests of the country during the eighteen years of the administration of my hon. friends opposite? Were there no good crops then? The crop of last year has not been accounted for yet in the market. One-half of the crop of the Territories is still within the Territories, or at least between there and Fort William. It has not gone forward, so that it could not be that particular crop, and it was not in that particular year, because if my hon. friend will look at the year before I think he will find it was a little more—one hundred and four millions.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Would the hon. gentleman attribute the proportionate increase of United States exports to Great Britain to the same cause?