other end of the Chamber, considerable encouragement in the matter of preferential trade. I will also tell the hon. gentleman that I have no doubt the Finance Minister regards preferential trade as an excellent red herring to draw across the track; and so far, he is sure of the sympathy of the Minister of Finance if he will aid and assist him in that benevolent purpose. Now, the hon. gentleman dwelt at length on the percentages of increase in the volume of trade, and with great discrimination he selected 1878, the worst of a prolonged period of depression, as the starting point. Well, Sir, I can do, if I like—though I do not often take the trouble—a little in the matter of percentages, and I will tell him how they come out. I will begin at 1868 and go to 1878. In 1868 the grand total of our imports and exports was 130 millions; in 1878 it was 172 millions. The grand total had increased in those ten years, 42 millions, being at the rate of a little over 3 per cent per annum, compounded. From 1878 to 1888 the sum total had increased from 172 millions to about 201 millions, being less than 2 per cent per annum during those ten years, and 50 per cent less than the increase from 1868 to 1878. If he chooses to add the other five years, it would only make, all told, an increase of about 2½ per cent during the whole fourteen years from 1878 to1892,as against the increase from 1868 to 1878. Well, it is satisfactory to know there is some increase; but I am bound to say, it does not strike me as being such an overwhelming increase for a country in the position of Canada. If we come to the hon. gentleman's favourite per capita argument, and if we take the trade of twenty years ago, we find that in 1873 our grand total of exports and imports was $217,811,000. This year it is $241,000,000. Now, our population in 1873 was under four millions, and our trade amounted to $57 per head. In 1892, when our population is about five millions, our trade per head is $48. Our trade to-day is $9 per head less than it was nineteen years ago, and $45 a family less than it was at that time. As I have said, I do not depreciate the increase, I am very glad to see it, but, at the same time, let the hon. gentleman do his—what shall I call it?—his roaring with some discretion, and not select facts that any school boy who has access to the Trade and Navigation Returns can turn upside down with five minutes' attention. Sir, the plain fact of the matter is this—and the Minister of Finance ought to understand it, and if he does not understand it, it will be our more or less painful duty to make it plain to him—the position of the greater part of Canada to-day, the position, at any rate, of the older provinces of Canada, is that of a country which has unfortunately fallen to a stationary or retrograde condition. There has been an enormous shrinkage in values, a shrinkage which largely overbears all the increases which the hon. gentleman has enumerated. Canada, moreover,—and this is a serious consideration for a Minister of Finance, with or without a diploma—Canada, moreover, is largely a tribute-paying country. We are obliged every year, either on account of individual or general indebtedness, to pay a sum of about 25 to 30 millions to our English creditors. Further than that, Canada is an enormously taxed country. First of all, there is a tax of 30 millions which goes into the Federal treasury; next to that, there is a tax, as I believe, of an amount about or quite equal, which goes into the pockets of the protected manufacturers; and thirdly, there is a very heavy tax paid to the United States Government under the operation of the McKinley tariff. Now, although I do not want to depreciate the value of English markets, I must tell the hon. gentleman, I must tell his followers, that they are leaning on a broken reed if they hope to induce the people of this country to believe that the English markets are going to compensate us, as regards the great majority of farm products, in any shape or way for the American markets we have lost. We may send cheese, we may send wheat, we may send beef, we may send dairy products generally to the English market and do well there; but for almost all other articles, for almost all the vegetables we raise, for our horses, for our barley and for our eggs, I tell the hon. gentleman that it is an absurdity, 'in rerum natura,' to suppose that the English market, under any circumstances, will ever be one-half as favourable to us as the American market is known to be. Now, Sir, I spoke just now of the amount which we paid to the protected manufacturers. This is an important point, bearing largely on the whole argument of the hon. gentleman. Now, I think those in the House on either side who have paid any attention to economic questions, will agree that the measure of a tax is of necessity the difference between the cost of the article consumed under such a system, and the cost of the same article in open market. I will apply that test to a very few manufactures. First of all, we will take the article of cotton. Now, Sir, from cotton last year we obtained a revenue of $1,114,000. What was the tax that we paid on the article of cotton? There is a difficulty here, because there is some dispute as to the exact value of the cotton consumed in this country. Various figures have been given to me. Some persons put it at $4 per head, some put it at a little less; but having made a careful examination into the amount formerly imported and the amount of raw material now consumed, I believe that I am well within the mark in saying that the total value of the cotton goods now consumed in Canada, ranges somewhere between $17,000,000 and $20,000,000, including what is imported and what is produced in this country. Sir, it is known to all hon. gentlemen here that our taxes on cotton, especially on the coarser varieties go into high figures; but I