

very small portion of the community; and I state now, as I stated then, that a high tariff produces smuggling, encourages smuggling. I am quite willing to acknowledge that an amount of smuggling is done, but by a very small fraction of the community, that is, the men who do professional smuggling, who follow it for a business. I have taken the trouble to look at a return which was moved for by an hon. member on this side. I will read a few items, to show that we are no worse than our neighbors, that we are not sinners above all in Canada. This does not give the amount of goods seized or confiscated under the law, but the amount of fines imposed under the law. We cannot arrive at a very correct conclusion as to the amount of smuggling done, as to the amount of sin perpetrated in this way by the various portions of this Dominion; but, as to the fines, I will read the following figures to show that they are not much better in Ontario than they are in New Brunswick. These are the numbers and the amount of fines imposed during the past year at the places named:

	Number.	Amount.
Brockville	26	\$ 978
Cornwall	14	392
Fort Erie	29	2,967
Hamilton	13	3,390
Ottawa	19	228
Toronto	26	1,554
Windsor	26	7,064
Stamstead	27	1,480
Woodstock.....	13	665

Woodstock is in my county. I do not think it lies in the hon. gentleman's breast to accuse us of being greater sinners than others. I am sorry there is any smuggling at all, any illicit traffic of that kind, but a high tariff offers a premium and an inducement to be dishonest.

The item of "woollen rags" was dropped.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Minister of Customs professes to be very much rejoiced that he has been the means of converting members of this side of the House to his views on protection. I am sorry to dispel the illusion, but I have to inform him that there has been no conversion made. Hon. gentlemen on this side pointed out the hollow pretences made by the hon. gentlemen and his colleagues when they pretended to protect the farmers. Wool was one of the few things which they could protect so as to afford protection to the farmers. I need not state to the committee what has been so often proved, that it is impossible to protect articles of which we export a surplus. If we take grain, for instance, of which the farmers of Canada have a large amount to export, over and above what they consume, it is utterly impossible to afford that protection. But there is the article of wool, of which we do not raise a sufficient quantity, which they could protect and failed to protect, and not only so, but they had not the manliness to avow it. While pretending to protect the farmers they had not the manliness to say they were going to put shoddy on the free list, but they brought it in by a side wind, by Order in Council, to compete with the wool the farmer raised. It was another case in which they promised the farmer bread and gave him a stone. They damaged the farmer in another way. I read the speech of the Finance Minister in introducing this very tariff, in which he describes the wearer of shoddy cloth, which he was going to protect the people of the country against; how, when he got into a shower of rain, he would have his knees through his pants and his elbows through the sleeves of his coat; and the hon. gentleman was going to protect the people of Canada against anything of that kind in future. How has he kept his promise? I believe they were ashamed to place shoddy on the free list, but after passing the tariff, they placed it there by an Order in Council. There has not been much objection made to it, and now they thought it would be an opportune time to bring it in and make it free by Act of Parliament. As a measure of protection to the consumers

of the country, there ought to have been a high tariff placed upon it, to keep it from competing with the wool raised by the farmers; and, as has been pointed out to-night, that industry is getting into a worse and worse condition. The part of the country I live in was a large wool and mutton producing district, but owing to the competition of foreign wool and shoddy, the farmers are going out of the business, and what was a source of revenue is being lost to the country. The farmers were injured by it in another way. It is within my recollection that agents of these shoddy manufacturers and dealers in shoddy cloth went around, pretending to sell the cloth at half price to the farmers, taking their notes as the price of good cloth, selling the notes to the note brokers, pocketing the money, and leaving the people with the poor cloth and the debts to pay. I am glad to think that the Government have been forced by public opinion, if not by the arguments used on this side of the House, to change their policy on this question.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, although he declares he has converted us to his way of thinking, has abandoned the resolution which the Government has submitted to the House and the committee. It is rather an extraordinary position that, although the hon. gentleman has converted us to his way of thinking, he has abandoned his own proposition and adopted our views. Is not the hon. gentleman laboring under some hallucination? Is he not mistaken as to the party who has been converted? My impression is that the hon. gentleman and the Minister who sits beside him are the parties who have undergone a change. My hon. friend beside me says they have not been converted, but they have been convicted. At all events, it is very clear that these hon. gentlemen have a wholesome dread of public opinion, and that upon this question they know right well that the interest of the farmer and the policy of the Government do not exactly coincide, and they know very well that when the farming population discover what their interest really is, they are not likely to follow in the wake of the Administration. I rose to ask the hon. gentleman, if he strikes these goods off the free list, where does he intend to place them? Does he intend that they shall be put amongst unenumerated articles, or does he propose to place them in some specific class, and will he state precisely what the duty is to be? I think this is a favorable opportunity for the hon. gentleman to tell us in what particular list these goods are to be placed.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I wish to know whether I am under an erroneous impression in relation to the working of the tariff upon wool. By the returns, I find that there is an importation of something over 6,000,000 lbs. of free wool, and an importation of a little over 6,000 lbs. of duty-paying wool; hence, as I read it, the practical operation of the tariff is, that of 1,000 lbs. of wool imported, one pound pays duty and 999 lbs. come in free of duty. I notice further, that the duty-paying wool belongs to a class which we certainly do not raise. I find that the average price of that wool is 55 cents per pound. In regard to foreign rags, I would simply remark that I am no friend to them. We will take care of our own rags. I am neither a friend to rags nor to those who use them for shoddy. I am perfectly willing that other countries should keep their rags and their paupers as well; and I am very glad to know that we are not going to spend more money in fetching them here, and consequently shall not need the rags. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) stated that it was his belief that the exclusion of rags would tend to lessen the consumption of wool, by our being unable to manufacture that class of shoddy blankets into the manufacture of which they enter. For the sake of the argument, we will suppose it will have that effect to the extent of the importation of blankets. I find that the entire