

of \$27,483,160 imported from Great Britain. These are dutiable goods, they do not include free goods or goods brought in for manufacture. This is equivalent, they will find, if hon. gentlemen will figure out the calculation, to a duty of 30 per cent. In the same year they levied \$6,960,950 in duty on dutiable goods worth \$25,823,936 imported from the United States. If they will figure that out, they will find that I am correct when I say the duty levied on dutiable goods imported from the United States was 27 as against 30 per cent of duty levied on goods imported from Great Britain. This means paying a bonus of 10 per cent of duty as an inducement to importers to purchase goods in the American market rather than in the markets of the motherland.

This has had its effect on our trade with the motherland which they profess to love so well. In 1893-94 we sold in Great Britain of the products of Canada—I do not include in this amount products we sent on as carriers, but the products of our own country—the value of \$60,000,000, and we purchased their goods, dutiable and free, to the value of \$38,000,000. In the same year we sold in the United States of goods the products of Canada the value of \$32,500,000, and purchased their goods, dutiable and free, to the value of \$53,000,000; in other words, we sold in Great Britain products to the value of \$60,000,000, buying only the value of \$38,000,000, and taking \$22,000,000 in cash to balance our account. We sold in the United States products to the value of \$32,500,000, and spent all that sum there in the purchase of goods of American production, and we left them over \$20,000,000 in cash besides.

The iniquitous discrimination of the tariff against British trade was long since denounced by Liberals, and in 1892 the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), moved :

Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain should be reduced.

On division it was found, however, that the House was not of this opinion, that the Liberals only were of this opinion, and that the Government and every hon. gentleman in the House supporting them was of the contrary opinion and believed that the discrimination should be continued.

The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) moved the following motion :—

That if, and when, the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a substantial reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.

Not content with the admission into British ports of our products free of duty, the hon.

Mr. DAWSON.

gentleman and his colleagues and friends in this House would have Great Britain tax the food supply she draws from the nations to whom she sells her goods—tax that food supply, admit ours free, and in return we would not remove the duty levied on goods imported from England, but grant substantial reductions.

Well, she will never do it. We send her 6 per cent of her whole supply. It is rather too much to ask her to tax 94 per cent and admit 6 per cent free in return for such advantage as a substantial reduction on the duties laid against her goods would be. England knows too well the blessing of free trade to ever consent to such an arrangement as that. The noblest statesman England ever had, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone—I am sure it is unnecessary for me to mention his name—has said :

You might as well attempt to overthrow trial by jury. You might as well attempt to overthrow the right of petition and of public meetings. You might as well try to tear out of our social and political system any one of the most cherished ideas that Englishmen have inherited from centuries of history, as to overset our free trade.

And well might he say it. Mightily has England prospered under free trade. It has become the fashion of hon. gentlemen opposite of late to decry the motherland. Driven from protectionist countries, tens of thousands of men every year find their way to the shores of England in search of that employment which they cannot find at home, and if hon. members will analyse the ranks of the unemployed in England, they will find that almost every man unemployed is a foreigner, who has come to England seeking that employment which he cannot obtain in the protectionist countries of Europe; and, when people hold up the fact that four millions of people are to-day wanting employment there, it is no argument whatever against the system of free trade which has so long prevailed in England.

They say, however, that free trade is killing England; and the Minister of Justice declared in this House that she, driven from the civilized markets of the world, is forced to spend millions on her army and navy to enable her to force her manufactured goods on the uncivilized nations of the world. And yet with England in this pitiful condition, compelled to spend millions to enable her to force her goods on unwilling customers, they will not open Canadian ports to her. They even tax her 3 per cent more than they do her great rival, the United States.

Wealth has increased in England under free trade. The national debt has been reduced, pauperism has decreased, crime has decreased, and trade has mightily expanded. The United Kingdom exported, in 1840, \$255,000,000 worth of goods; in 1893, she exported \$1,348,000,000, an increase of over 500 per cent. These \$1,348,000,000 worth of ex-