

the indisputable fact—say what you will of the McKinley Act—that if its operation has been injurious to any class, it has been to the interests of the people of the United States themselves and not to the people of Canada. I repeat, our trade being direct with England, instead of through the United States, gives the best possible evidence that we are reaping a great benefit financially and pecuniarily from the operation of the McKinley Act, to the loss and detriment of the people engaged in trade in the United States. If this is satisfactory to the people of that country, we certainly can have no cause to complain.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—That is the difference between free trade and protection.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Precisely, so far as affects the United States, but not in the sense in which the hon. gentleman intended to apply it. I probably may have something to say at some future time with regard to this question of free trade *versus* protection. We have it constantly stated that our policy taxes the importations from England at a much greater percentage than the goods we import from the United States, and that therefore we are discriminating against England because we import a greater quantity of English goods which pay a heavier percentage of duty than those which come from the United States. Had any one of these gentlemen, who have so freely and so often spoken upon this point in connection with the trade of the country, taken the trouble to calculate the percentage of duties paid upon goods imported from England in 1878 and 1892—the one being under what was termed the revenue trade policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the other under the protective or National Policy of the present Government—they would have found that the relative percentages are so nearly alike that there is scarcely any appreciable difference between them. I will give you the percentages, that the electorate may know when they hear this statement again that, even if the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition should unfortunately for the country find his way to the treasury benches and return to the old policy and reduce the tariff to one for revenue purposes only, the same results would follow that which flowed from their tariff in 1878. I have had this calculation made very closely and accurately. It is as follows:—

Rate of duty—Compared. (Imports.)

	Dutiable.	Free.	Total.	Duty.	Rate.
1892.					Per cent
Great Britain...	\$ 30,831,809	\$ 10,516,626	\$ 41,348,435	\$ 9,074,200	21.9
United States...	29,505,550	23,632,022	53,137,572	7,814,588	14.7
	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.2
1878.					
Great Britain...	32,139,783	5,291,397	37,431,180	6,445,985	17.2
United States...	23,464,503	25,163,686	48,628,189	4,790,426	9.8
	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.4

When you consider this important fact in connection with our importations from Great Britain and the United States you will find the statement of the opponents of our trade policy, so far as it affects British trade unfair. If you consult the Trade and Navigation Returns you will find that a large proportion of the duties paid on articles coming from England are collected on wines, liquors, silk and other luxuries which are used by the wealthier classes of the people. Take liquors for instance, the duties imposed on them average from 100 to 150 percent. Liquors come principally from Great Britain, not from the United States; and if you deduct the duty paid on silks, satins, liquors and wines imported from Great Britain, from the aggregate trade of the country you will find that the percentage would be lower upon the articles imported from England than those upon goods from the United States. Yet we hear the statement constantly made that we discriminate against Great Britain and even see it repeated in letters published over their own names, in their newspaper reports, and in their editorials on the same subject, that we are discriminating against Great Britain, from the fact that taking the percentage based on the importa-