

he directly traced to the evils of a high protective tariff. I say let us take warning from their sad experience ere it is too late.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Is the Wilson Bill, as it went to the Senate, higher or lower than the Canadian tariff?

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—The Canadian tariff can be called a 35 per cent tariff.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—Taking the average it is about that. The Mackenzie tariff was 17½ per cent. The United States tariff, as it stands at the present time, is 49 per cent, but as the bill came from the House of Representatives it was only a 35 per cent tariff, and although the alterations made in it in the Senate have been very extensive, yet on the whole they have reduced it, I think, to 34 per cent.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Does the hon. gentleman, in making this statement, include all the goods imported, or merely the dutiable goods?

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—The dutiable goods only, not the free. I must congratulate the government that they are about to revise the tariff, and I sincerely hope that they will reduce it to a much lower point than it is at present—that they will raise the excise duties of this country, and lower the customs duties. A short time ago I had occasion to look into the excise and customs duties of 1879—the last year of the Mackenzie administration, and compare them with the duties of 1890. I found that the customs revenue for the fiscal year 1879, when the Mackenzie policy was still in force—under a 17½ per cent tariff—was \$12,000,000. In 1890 they were \$23,900,000—almost double. I found that the excise duties in 1879 amounted to \$5,400,000. I found that in 1890 they had only increased to \$7,700,000, an increase of only \$2,300,000 not 50 per cent, whereas the increase in customs was nearly 100 per cent.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Do you want free liquor?

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—No, I do not. I am not a teetotaler; I am not an extremist on that subject, but I say this: I

think the tariff ought to be framed in such a way that it would bear heavily on the luxuries, and not on the actual necessities of life.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Quite right.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—That is the reason why the English tariff has been so framed, and I suppose the hon. gentleman is perfectly aware of the fact that the revenue of England is in round figures \$450,000,000.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—It is the worst tariff in the world for the poor.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—One half of that enormous sum is derived from excise duties, on spirit in its different forms, from tobacco, duties on tea, raisins and coffee—half the English revenue is derived from those articles—\$225,000,000 in round figures.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Within the last few years the tariff has been materially raised upon imported spirit, and the excise duties have been increased. If you make the duties any higher you offer an incentive to smugglers.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—It is not keeping pace with the customs. The customs have been increased very much more than the excise. If it had been increased at the same rate, we would have collected \$10,000,000 instead of \$7,000,000 from excise.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—The hon. gentleman's deduction is quite right, if the people drank as much, but the relative increase has been quite as much in the excise as in the customs.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—The hon. gentleman said he made a calculation and found that the customs duty was about 35 per cent now.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—About that.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—What is the present excise duty? It is 700 per cent in some cases.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—I crave your indulgence if I address a few remarks to the House at so late an hour. I shall hurry on as fast as possible to come to the points in dispute, but I cannot help joining with the