

dissolve the wool would have precisely the same effect on the shoddy.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman said that he had seen cheap blankets made from wool and shoddy, and his whole argument was intended to show that the statement of the Finance Minister was not correct because he had seen blankets tested by the chemical, which had dissolved all the wool that was in them but did not dissolve the cotton.

Mr. BLAKE. It was the wool.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is very logical on most questions that he attempts to discuss, but any person who listened to him could draw no other deduction from what he stated, than that he either intended to mislead the House, or was not aware of the article called shoddy. With regard to what the hon. gentleman says about the inferiority of shoddy, I quite agree with him; but when he says the people argued that shoddy should not be worn because it is of inferior quality and brought from the Old Country, the only answer I have to make is that shoddy is made in this country, and if that class of goods is brought into the market it is much better that it should be manufactured here than that an inferior quality should be brought from the Old Country, on which a heavy duty is paid. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) make the statement that there was no duty on wool. I am not surprised at anything that might be said by the "common sense" gentleman who hails from Carleton (Mr. Irvine) because I have no doubt he knows all about farming. I am not a farmer, but I have paid considerable attention to farming operations in the neighborhood where I have lived, having been connected with agricultural societies, not only there but in other parts of Ontario; and I know that 20 years ago the farmers in my section of the country attempted to raise Merino sheep, and they gave up the attempt simply because it was not profitable. If the hon. gentleman turns to the tariff, he will find that there is a duty on some classes of wool—on the wool produced from the South Down sheep, which, I think I am safe in saying, is about the only kind of sheep raised in this Dominion to any extent that produces a fine wool.

Mr. CASEY. There is no duty on South Down wool, according to the wording of the tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. South Down combing wool is South Down wool. The combing wool is generally from South Downs.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, it is the long fine wool that is sheared from the sheep. There is a duty on Leicester, Cotswold, Lincoln, and South Down combing wools.

Mr. GUNN. South Down wool is a fine, short wool.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I am aware of that; but there is South Down combing wool.

Mr. MILLS. There is no such wool as South Down combing wool.

Mr. BOWELL. I will not discuss that with the hon. gentleman who may be better informed about wool than about some other matters. I think the tariff covers every class of wool grown in Canada. Before this paragraph was placed in the tariff, the fullest investigation was made as to the different classes of sheep raised in this country. If, as the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., says, he has good reason to know that the wool which is covered by this tariff is brought into the country without paying duty, I suppose it is brought in in the same manner as he told us a couple of years ago a large quantity of cotton and other goods were brought into his county, that is by smuggling.

Mr. IRVINE. The National Policy brought them in.

Mr. BOWELL. I freely admit that wool like other classes of goods brought into the country, may pass the Customs officers and be admitted free through the misrepresentations of those who import them. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) argued very strenuously that we were now placing on the free list an article which has been on the free list since 1879. It was thought better, in bringing this question of changes or alterations in the tariff before the House, that all the articles which had been placed on the free list by Orders in Council should be included, in order that every person might see what was on the free list, instead of having the information confined to the *Official Gazette*. If there has been any error, and I am not prepared to say there has not, it is that these articles were not at each Session of Parliament placed on the free list when alterations in the tariff were made; and if in future articles are to be placed on the free list by the power given to the Governor in Council, I quite agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that they should be placed in the tariff at each Session of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I just wish to explain a statement which the hon. gentleman seems to have misapprehended. The chemicals alluded to destroy the woollen substance of the blanket. If you have a fine all-wool blanket, they destroy the blanket along the edge; and if that blanket has a certain quantity of cotton matter into it, that appears, and you can find the different grades by the quantity of matter remaining after the application of chemicals. I do not deny that when the wool is destroyed, whether the blanket be of all-wool or shoddy, the blanket is destroyed.

Mr. SCRIVER. I only desire to say a word or two on this subject. I think the Government could not have chosen a worse time than the present for this policy of admitting shoddy free of duty. I have been informed by woollen manufacturers that the greatest consumption by us of Canadian wool is in the manufacture of blankets; more of it is used for that purpose than for cloths. I am quite positive the price of Canadian wool has never been so low as it is this year. I heard the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) a few minutes ago speak of the price of Canadian wool being 20 cents. It may be worth that in Ontario, but certainly not in Quebec. One large manufacturer of woollen goods in the Province of Quebec told me that he had bought Canadian wool as low as 16 cents and that he could buy any quantity at 18 cents. It seems to me to be adding insult to injury for the Government, after having refused in their tariff to grant protection to Canadian growers of wool, to open the door to the importation of an article that will come into direct competition with wool in the manufacture especially of blankets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to correct a misunderstanding or a mistake into which the Minister of Finance has fallen. With respect to his manufactory of blankets in Napanee, I think I am entitled to speak with some authority, seeing that I am myself proprietor of the factory. I believe it is true that the party who at the time of the hon. gentleman's visit worked that factory—for a short time—combined the shoddy and the wool in the manufacture of blankets; and I may tell the hon. gentleman the result was he produced a very inferior article and to my sorrow and loss went into bankruptcy accordingly. His successor has stated to me that he intends to carry out, and no doubt will carry out in its integrity, the policy of making the blankets of honest Canadian wool.

Mr. ORTON. I concur in the opinion that it is not desirable to encourage the use of shoddy to the detriment of Canadian wool. I recollect very well the reason why a duty was not placed on all-wool coming into Canada. It was represented by the