

Mr. CASEY. The Oxford Down wool is somewhat longer than the others, and in extreme cases it may be as long as the hon. gentleman says, four or five inches, but I never saw any of that length, and I have seen the Oxford Down prize sheep at several provincial exhibitions. We know as a matter of fact, that as a general thing, the Down sheep is a short woolled sheep, including the South Down, the Oxford, Shropshire and the Hampshire Downs. As a general thing, I think a universal thing, the wool of these sheep is too short for combing. There may be exceptions, but that is the general rule, and therefore there is no protection on such wool. It is quite clear that the intention of the tariff was to avoid putting a duty on short wools, to avoid putting a duty on any wools which were not long combing wools.

Mr. BOWELL. Not grown here.

Mr. CASEY. There is no exception in regard to short wool grown in Canada. Whether it is of a kind grown in Canada or not, it comes in free, and that is what we complain of. When the tariff was first introduced, we complained of the lack of protection on wool. We were told: "We will protect it, we will protect the kind of wool that is grown in Canada and leave the other kind free until our manufactures are well established." But this protection on long wool is of no use to us, because we do not grow it, and the price has not been affected one cent and cannot be affected by any duty you put on it. On the other hand the price of short wool is within our control. We know that we do not raise enough to supply our manufactures and that a large quantity has to be imported. If you put a duty on it, you would raise the price by the full amount of that duty until the home supply was enough for the home market. Let me give a few figures to show how this affects the farmer.

Mr. IVES. What proportion of our farmers raise short wool?

Mr. CASEY. I will answer after I get through, not in the middle of a sentence. The amount of dutiable wool imported, combing and lustre wools, was 6,642 lbs., and that was imported into Ontario; nothing came into the other Provinces. There does not seem to be any great competition in that. The wool exported from Canada during that time, composed entirely of long combing wools, which go entirely to the United States, was something over 1,600,000 lbs. More than 1,600,000 lbs. of Canadian grown wool had to seek a foreign market for lack of a home market. Now, see how much wool was imported free to enter into competition with our short wool. From Great Britain, 1,667,000 lbs.; from the United States, 2,961,000 lbs. My hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe says we cannot compete with those countries where sheep run out all the year round, such as Australia and the Cape, but we find that the greatest quantity of wool imported is from the United States, where sheep are grown under about the same conditions as they are in Canada.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not American wool; it is African wool, which comes through the United States.

Mr. CASEY. Well, it would not be a bad idea if the hon. gentleman would have the Trade and Navigation Returns show where the wool really does come from. I am well aware, however, that there is a large amount of short wool grown in the United States. In 1883-84 we imported altogether 6,182,421 lbs. of wool free of duty to enter into competition with the home grown article, and we paid for it \$1,170,844, which is about 19 cents a pound. Now, Sir, in addition to that competition we find that woollen rags have been imported already to a large extent free of duty. I find that 179,047 lbs. of woollen rags have been imported at a price of \$21,924, or about 12 cents a pound, all coming into competition with our wool. Fancy, these rags which are worth about 12 cents a pound, being allowed to

come in free of duty, to enter into competition with our wool which is already at an absurdly low price. There is no doubt that short wool at present is bringing a higher price in our Canadian markets than long wool. It would bring that higher price for export purposes if there were no woollen manufactures in Canada at all. But it is clear that with these many millions of pounds of foreign wool coming into competition with it, and the rags coming into competition with it, any increase in the woollen manufactures of Canada under the National Policy has not increased the price of short wool. It is absurd to pretend that long wool has been increased in price. It is getting gradually lower. Now, I urge upon the Government that there is an opportunity of giving an increased price to the farmer for one of his products. This is almost the only case in which they can increase the price of any of his products, and yet it is the only instance in which they have refused to put a tax on, and therefore to increase that price; I urge upon them that if they wish to show the fair play they professed they would show to all classes of the community they should put a tax upon short wool. The hon. gentleman from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has asked what percentage of the farmers grow short woolled sheep. I have not the Ontario returns at hand just now, which show how many of these short woolled sheep were raised in that Province during the last year. I cannot therefore tell him exactly, but in my neighborhood I may say that at least every second farmer, I think, at the present time has begun raising these sheep. In two or three years every farmer who keeps sheep at all will keep short woolled sheep and nothing else. The short wool industry is to be the wool raising industry of Canada in the future. I think at the present time the short wool in Ontario would represent nearly one-sixth of the entire clip, and perhaps one-fifth, and that proportion is growing year by year very rapidly. Short woolled sheep are growing in favor, but the long woolled sheep are being packed off as rapidly as possible, because it does not pay to keep them at the present prices of wool. I think, Sir, that is sufficient, in addition to what has been said, to make out the farmers' case. But I must insist that not only the Minister of Customs, but the Finance Minister himself, in whose hands this matter is, shall tell the country something of his intentions in regard to it, that he shall tell us whether he intends to continue this insulting and injurious treatment towards the farmers of this country from whom, after all, he draws the whole of his revenue in the last resort.

Mr. ORTON. I think I can point out to the hon. gentleman how the National Policy has benefited the farmer on the wool question. He stated just now that the price of short wool was higher than the price of long wool, and if he knew anything about the wool trade he would know that previous to the introduction of the National Policy short wool and long wool brought the same price. In consequence of the increase in the number of woollen manufactures in Canada and increased demand for wool, he would know that the value of short wool had increased until it is at least ten cents higher than the price of long wool. The reason is that in former times, though the intrinsic value of short wool was always higher, buyers of wool did not give the farmers any more for it than for long wool. The quantity of short wool raised at the time was small, it was classed with the long wool, and bought at the same price. But now, in consequence of the increase of the woollen manufactures in this country, the demand for short wool has rapidly increased, so that farmers have found it to their advantage—as I had the honor of pointing out at the time the former Government were in power—to go more largely into the raising of the various Downs, because short wool was valuable for manufacturing purposes. I am happy to say to-day that