

with the right hon. member for Kingston or the hon. member for Cumberland, because they were resolved upon a policy which was, in its nature and effect, the most disloyal policy that could be carried out against the connection with Great Britain and the interests of the whole empire. But the right hon. member for Kingston condescended to particularize. He was good enough to suggest that we might have a duty on iron, woollen goods, boots and shoes, and on cottons. Those were the only direct propositions the right hon. gentleman made. The country was to have a retaliatory, national and disloyal policy; it was to take care of the manufacturing, agricultural and mining interests, but especially to take care of the iron, woollen and shoe manufactures, and of the cotton trade. They had some information the other day about the cotton trade, and if hon. gentlemen remembered what appeared in the papers a few days ago in regard to one of the large Canadian cotton manufactories, he thought they would concede that no necessity arose for any protection to that industry.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario): How much dividend did they declare during the four years before that?

MR. DYMOND said the hon. member had suggested that they had only declared a small dividend for the four previous years. Why did not the hon. gentleman or his leader give them Protection four years ago? He did not remember any speech made by the hon. gentleman on Protection four years ago, although the hon. gentleman claimed to be a most consistent Protectionist.

MR. GIBBS (North Ontario) said that, when manufacturers were protected by a 15 per cent. tariff, they were much better off than now with 25 or 30 per cent.

MR. DYMOND said it was evident that industry did not want the protection which hon. gentlemen opposite proposed to give them. Under the old Government it had 15 per cent. protection, while under the present Administration it had 17½ per cent. It was, moreover, no longer an infantile industry, which was put forward at one time as a strong plea in favour of a Protective policy.

MR. DYMOND.

MR. COLBY asked if the hon. member for North York vouched for the accuracy of the statement that the dividend was paid, and that the earnings were made.

MR. DYMOND said the statements were published from the company's report; if that was false, let the company take the consequences.

MR. GIBBS (North Ontario): What is the name of the company?

MR. DYMOND said they might pass from that point, because he was about to add something by way of confirmation. They had had the privilege of having before a Committee of the House manufacturers of cotton goods, and, although it appeared they were suffering to a certain extent from the depression, no evidence was offered that they desired protection; no evidence was offered but this: that, like any other firm of manufacturers in the country, they were more or less suffering from the depression of trade, but that they felt no necessity, and had no desire to receive additional protection. When he said "desire," he meant they were not eager and anxious for it, and did not urge it. Almost every man would be glad to have protection, if given to him voluntarily. He remembered distinctly that, before the Depression Committee in 1876, either the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald) or Mr. Andrew Robertson had stated that from one of the cotton manufactories he had received a very fair dividend on his investment in the company. However, he had the satisfaction to know, from the evidence of his hon. friend the member for Centre Toronto, that these persons were protected, at present, to the extent of thirty per cent. The right hon. member for Kingston demanded that woollens should be protected. There were a great many woollen manufactories in Canada, and, from evidence given before Committees of this House, the only complaint in this connection was, not that American goods came into competition with our woollens, — for, as far as the ordinary goods were concerned, scarcely any American woollens entered the Canadian market, — but that British shoddy, as it was