

make no difference what amount of duty was imposed on it. But there should be a duty imposed on medium wool, because that is a quality we produce and which to some extent we import. Therefore, the true principle in dealing with the wool duties on the principle of the National Policy is to admit the higher classes, which we do not grow, free of duty; to impose a duty on the medium class, because it is a class we grow for home consumption; and as to the coarse wool, it makes no difference what duty is imposed.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman omits a very important point in regard to the National Policy. He knows right well that in Michigan and Ohio, and the adjoining States, there is no coarse wool produced, and that all the sheep kept are Merinos. They can be kept as well in Canada as in Michigan and Ohio. Why are they not kept?

An hon. MEMBER. Because it will not pay.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; because it will not pay so long as we admit the fine Cape wools and the Australian wools free of duty. Let the Government impose a duty and they will produce precisely the same conditions as prevail in Michigan and Ohio, and they will produce exactly the change in sheep growing in Canada as has been produced in those States. I am not saying that that is the best course in the public interest; I do not say so. I believe that if the National Policy was in the public interest, it would be the best course to follow. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not dealing candidly with the people when they pretend to say that the Government do not impose a duty on fine wools because they are not produced in Canada. The very moment you impose a duty they will be produced, and if it is in the public interest you can produce the same change in sheep growing, by imposing a duty on fine wools, as has been produced in Michigan and Ohio. Besides, we manufactured a few years ago tweed goods in which the coarser class of wools were largely used. These are produced no longer. Why? Because fine wools are introduced; a handsomer article is manufactured, and our Canadian wools have ceased to be worked up to the same extent in our Canadian manufactures as formerly. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House says we should not impose any duty on fine wool, because they do not come into competition with our wools. I say they do, and that they have driven the coarser wools out of the establishments of the country and the finer classes have taken their place. From my point of view, I admit it is not in the public interest to impose a duty on wools; but I say if the National Policy was in the public interest and if hon. gentlemen opposite were as anxious to maintain the home market for Canadian farmers as they profess to be, they would impose a duty on fine wools, and the sheep on which fine wools are grown would be raised in Canada instead of coarse wool sheep, for whose product no market can be found in this country.

Mr. ALLEN. I would beg to say a word in reply to the hon. member for Welland, who said that no English-grown wool was imported into Canada. This, Sir, I know to be incorrect, and I know the trade of which I am speaking, and could mention the names of parties who have inspected hundred of thousands of pounds of this English wool.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman who spoke recently (Mr. McNeill) was good enough to say, if I understood him rightly, that the present National Policy had greatly increased woollen manufacture in Canada. Of all the false charges brought against the Mackenzie Administration there was none, perhaps, more false than the charge that they had injured the woollen manufactures of Canada, although that charge was repeated from husting to husting and from Province to Province. As good a test as we possess of the way in which the woollen manufactures grew, is found in the amount of wool imported into this

country. I want to call the attention of those hon. gentlemen who boast that they have increased the woollen manufactures of Canada, and that the policy of the Mackenzie Administration injured it, to these simple facts. In 1874 the woollen manufacturers of Canada imported 3,756,000 lbs. of wool. In 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, they imported 6,230,000 lbs. In 1884 they imported 5,182,000 lbs. of wool—50,000 lbs. less than they imported in 1878, whereas in 1878 they imported 2,500,000 lbs. more than they imported in 1874.

Mr. WIGLE. I notice, Sir, that two or three years ago hon. gentlemen were the champions of the manufacturers, but to-day they are the champions of the farmers. I am surprised to hear hon. gentlemen speaking about the farmers not getting what their wool is worth. I know that between 1873 and 1878 I bought wool for less than 25 cents a pound, and at that time the farmers were paying from 75 to 85 cents for the same kind of cloth which they now get for 50 to 60 cents a yard; so that in reality the farmers are getting their cloth cheaper in proportion now than they were when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when he spoke a few minutes ago, referred to Michigan and Ohio, and he said why do not we grow short wool as they do? The reason is that the carcasses of these Merino sheep are no good, and that is one reason why sheep are scarce in Ontario to-day, and the farmers are taking sheep from this country into the United States. Take the case of the Ontario Agricultural College. We find that the people of this country are finding fault because they are selling sheep to people in the United States instead of keeping these finely bred sheep in the country. I was surprised to hear these hon. gentlemen speak about the difference between shoddy now and shoddy a few years ago. I have statistics here about the shoddy made in one institution in this country, and there are many others of the same kind. I refer to the Weston Woollen Mills, about seven miles west of Toronto. This institution commenced in 1879; it employs in the neighborhood of 300 hands, and manufactures tweeds, blankets, linings, etc., all the products of rags. In 1879 they did import rags from other countries, but since that time they have not imported them; and they are not importing a single pound to day. More than that, they are doing more than \$300,000 worth of business yearly, from rags which they buy from poor people at from 2 to 8 cents per pound. In addition, I find that there are peddlers going through the country buying rags and cast-off clothing; and this same factory, in addition to the 300 hands I mentioned, employ 70 or 80 women and girls in Toronto—girls who, when the hon. gentlemen were in power, were to be found in the soup kitchens instead of earning regular wages. They use from eight to ten car loads of wool oil in this country; 600 to 700 barrels, manufactured in London and Petrolia. This work was formerly done in England, and shipped to this country. The shoddy of England is not better than the shoddy of this country, because the rags are not picked so close here. More than that; outside of the oil which is used, they use from six to seven thousand dollars worth of soap yearly, manufactured in this country. I would like to know where all these hands which I have mentioned are boarding, if not on the farmers of this country. Before the National Policy this money was collected from the farmers of this country and sent to other countries to pay the board of laborers among the farmers of other countries, so that I say that it is an advantage to the farmers of this country, and the hon. gentlemen cannot get over it. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), was making a comparison the other day between the condition of things under the National Policy and under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. He said on account of the National Policy this was a dear