

clocks, and so the duty was increased. There was one print factory, and the duties had to be increased on prints; there was only one clock factory, and the duties had to be increased on clocks; but the hon. gentleman refuses to increase the duty on fine wools, because there are not enough farmers who are raising that kind of wool. It must be conceded that if they are able by artificial means to increase the price to the farmer, that price will make up to him for the unprofitableness of the operation. Although we on this side may have something to say on the question of who pays the duty in that and other cases, though we may discuss what the practical operation of the increased duty would be yet, applying the hon. gentleman's own policy, applying it to their own tariff, it is clear that the course proposed to us to-day is entirely inconsistent with that policy. It may be said that it has been on the free list for some time—I do not know how long before it was buried under an Order in Council, and I dare say the hon. gentleman is sorry that he has disinterred it and dragged it out to the light of day.

Mr. BOWELL. It was brought out before.

Mr. BLAKE. It was not fairly brought before us till now. May I ask the hon. gentleman what date it was.

Mr. BOWELL. It was the 17th of June, 1879—I cannot give the exact hour of the day.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not ask for the hour of the day, and the hon. gentleman knew I did not ask, but I suppose he intends his remark as a joke, and from him I will accept it as a very admirable joke. Under the hon. gentleman's policy we are obliged to accept inferior home-made goods, and I will accept this inferior home-made joke from the hon. gentleman. In June, 1879, shortly after the close of the Session, in order to carry out the great policy of giving us good, pure, honest, home-made Canadian goods, instead of that wretched Yorkshire shoddy, the hon. gentleman put on the free list woollen rags, which he now proposes that Parliament should assent to his continuing on the list.

Mr. IRVINE. There are some questions which I should like to ask the Finance Minister and I am sure he will answer them because I am deeply interested in getting the information. Of course no one is so deeply interested as myself, considering that I am a practical farmer, and I am one who as always declared at home and abroad, in the House and out of it that the National Policy is the greatest curse that ever came upon the farmer. The Government promised to give us protection, but they have given no protection to the farmers; it is true, that there are a few articles which were raised in price, but they had nothing to do with it. The hon. gentleman thought he made a good point on me when he stated—of course whether he meant it or not, and I suppose he did mean it—that the farmers were an intelligent class, and that they had voted confidence in the Government in two successive elections. I would ask the Finance Minister, when you inaugurated the National Policy did you not state at a public meeting that the National Policy had made a difference of 3 cents a bushel on oats? Now, I ask you—

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Mr. IRVINE. I will, Mr. Chairman. I am not accustomed to speaking, and therefore I made the mistake. I would ask him—I think I am right now, and of course being an Irishman I have the right to speak twice at any rate—I would ask him through you if they did not promise that the National Policy would be the great panacea for all the evils that the farmers were subject to? Did they not declare that this policy would enhance the price of wheat to the Canadian farmer? How has it been this year?

Mr. BLAKE.

When they went to the people of this country the first time the people were humbugged, and when they went the second time the Finance Minister told us with all his cunning and suavity that there were millions of money ready to be invested the moment this policy was ready to be carried in the country. That was the way he helped the farmers, and I would ask him if those millions have been invested in our mines and minerals as he promised. I ask him if he put the question fairly to the farmers? I ask him if in my county, where oats are 25 cents per bushel would we have only been getting 22 cents except for this National Policy, the national humbug? They deceived the people, but, if I mistake not the farmers of the country have had their eyes opened, and I doubt if the hon. gentleman with all his suavity can draw the wool over their eyes the next time. It will be shoddy the next time, a cheap article of wool. What a comfort it is to the farmer to find that wool is being imported into the country and that the price for which wool is selling in competition with the imported article is 20 cents per pound. It is said the cause is that the wools we raise here are not fine enough, but we have the very best authority for saying that a large portion of the wool which is imported is of the very class which is raised in this country. We raise every class of wool here; we have Leicesters, Lincolns, Spanish merino, Cotswold, South Downs and other kinds. But what can you expect to do for the farmer; 20 cents is enough for him. He will get to be too independent if you give him any protection. The best way is to brush him out altogether: I was sitting in my seat the other day when the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson), who is a lawyer, I believe, was speaking; he was the gentleman who was speaking when a very prominent lady was in the gallery.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. IRVINE. Very well, I will not refer to that, but what did the hon. gentleman say? You will find it stated in his speech that the farmers were greatly benefited by the National Policy because they manufactured more cheese now than they did formerly. I ask the hon. gentleman and the Finance Minister what the National Policy has done for the manufacture of cheese in this country. I would like the Finance Minister to stand up and tell us if the National Policy has been any benefit to the farmer by improving the price of any one article of farm produce.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The hon. gentleman says that wool is brought in at 20 cents per pound and that the farmers get only 20 cents per pound in competing against it. Unless this statement is carried out to the full and corrected, it conveys a wrong impression. He should have stated, in speaking of wool being imported at 20 cents per pound, that the wool when washed costs from 45 to 55 cents per pound—every pound used by the manufacturers when cleaned costs them 45 to 55 cents per pound. This wool, when brought from Australia and South America, is filled with sand, burrs and grease, and when cleaned it only returns from 36 to 41 per cent. of clean wool. This statement is necessary to be taken in connection with that of the hon. gentleman in order to convey a correct impression to this House and the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I am much obliged to the leader of the Opposition for the compliment he paid to me for the little joke, as he called it, that he said I made at his expense. If it gave any pleasure to him and to those who applauded him, I am gratified. I was somewhat amused at his dissertation on shoddy, and the effect which chemicals have upon wool. I agree with him that there are chemical preparations which will dissolve the wool from the cotton; but if there be blankets made from shoddy in this country, composed partially of woollen rags, the chemicals that would