

sufficient duty upon wool, to induce the farmers to go into raising fine wool sheep at the present time. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said that it does not pay as well as the coarse wool, but that is simply because the fine wool sheep do not exist in Canada at the present moment in any great numbers; and if the hon. gentleman believes that it is a good thing for the people of this country to adopt a protective policy, we can have fine wool growing made profitable if he can induce his leaders before him to impose a sufficient duty and give protection to fine wool. Then the agricultural population of Canada would no doubt go into raising fine wool sheep instead of the coarse wool sheep, as they are doing now. Sir, I was reminded of a fact which, perhaps, may not be known to every hon. gentleman in the House, and that is that at the time a committee sat for the purpose of taking evidence upon the causes of the depression of trade in 1878, that committee had before it several gentlemen who were engaged in the business of woollen manufacture, and a few asked to have a higher duty imposed upon importations of heavy woollen goods into Canada. They said that was specially to keep out shoddy cloths, that it came into competition with the valuable article which they were producing in their mills. We had a prominent supporter of the hon. gentleman opposite, who, I believe, is engaged extensively in the production of woollen goods at Almonte, not far from this city, who asked to have a higher duty imposed upon heavy woollen goods with the special object of keeping out shoddy cloths. This gentleman told the committee that it would not pay to engage in the manufacture of shoddy goods in this country; in fact, that it was not an honest pursuit and a proper thing to do. You were cheating the poor man, it was said; you were giving him a good-looking article, a cheap article, which was really a very poor article, and he got very much less for his money than if he had purchased an article made of Canadian wool. Now the hon. gentleman proposes to bring shoddy rags into competition with the combing wools of Canada. He proposes that rags be admitted free of duty to encourage the manufacture of shoddy goods in this country. At whose expense? At the expense of the farmers, at the expense of those who are raising Leicester and Cotswold sheep. The hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the injury done to the farming population by the heavy duties imposed under the National Policy, but he proposes to grind them down and interfere with them still further. The hon. gentleman has reduced the price of wool from 38 cents per lb. to 15 cents or 16 cents, and he now proposes to reduce it still further in value by bringing into competition with it woollen rags that are produced abroad. He is perfectly ready to pay something to the beggars in foreign countries in order that he may still further injure the farmers in his own country.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) paid a very high compliment to the farmers, and not a very high compliment to the members of the legal profession. I do not know but that I agree to some extent with the opinion he entertains.

Mr. MILLS. That refers, of course, to your leader.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am taking lawyers as a whole. There are some prominent gentlemen who stand head and shoulders above others of the profession. I might point to the leader of the Opposition, who is considered by his friends head and shoulders above every other legal man in the country; but it does not follow that every other lawyer possesses his astuteness and ability. I will give one of the reasons why I concur in that opinion with respect to the farmers. They showed intelligence and good judgment in 1878 by sending a majority to Parliament in favor of the National Policy. In 1882 it was endorsed by the farmers of the country, so the farmers in 1878 and 1882 have sustained the policy, and I am disposed to accept the statement of my

hon. friend that the farmers are very intelligent. Great zeal has been manifested by the hon. member for Bothwell with respect to the farmers and that hon. gentleman declared that we were destroying their market for wool. I visited the county of Lennox two years since, and when the people recently endorsed the National Policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The election courts have settled that question.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. What did I see in Lennox? In Napanee I visited a very large blanket factory, the owner of which has a lease from the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), who owns the land and the water power. That factory was manufacturing a blanket made in part of the wool of the country and in part of shoddy. We recollect, when the National Policy was before the House in 1879, we were told that an enormous duty was imposed on the lumberman's blankets. We were told it was desirable that lumbermen should obtain cheap blankets, as they just used them during one winter in camp and then threw them away. This manufacturer was making, by using shoddy in connection with wool, that very blanket which it was stated by some hon. gentlemen, representing lumber interests, they required. That is a practical illustration. At the establishment to which I have referred they were manufacturing blankets of all wool, as well as cheaper blankets of a mixture of wool and shoddy suitable for lumbermen.

Mr. BLAKE. You will find that the cheap heavy blankets made are not as a rule, I do not think ever, made of wool shoddy.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are in some cases.

Mr. BLAKE. I have seen the cheap blankets submitted to the chemical test that eliminates all the wool and leaves the strips of other articles not wool, the vegetable matter. I have seen the different grades and an actual application of the test, and although I do not desire to say but that there may be some blankets made of a mixture partly of long wool and partly of wool shoddy, so far as I am informed the bulk of the heavy blankets are made of a mixture of wools and vegetable matter, not of different classes of wool shoddy and wool. With respect to the hon. gentleman's statement I would say that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has pointed out that a time may come and will come soon, and is coming presently when the farmers will be in a position to claim a duty on fine wool. Is the hon. gentleman's policy not to protect the infant industries of this country? We thought it was because the industries were weak and struggling and puny, and because they were young that they were to be supported; and yet hon. gentlemen say, let them struggle along through their weakness and infancy till they attain strength without protection, and when they begin to be strong and powerful and of proved ability to stand alone, then they are entitled to demand protection. Then they will not need it. The hon. Minister has brought down Session after Session proposals to increase the duties because new industries were about to be started. The duty on prints was increased from 20 to 27 per cent. because there was a factory in Magog going to be started. It was not in operation, it was to be in operation by the 1st of January, and so in anticipation, before the factory wheels began to revolve, the protection was applied. Why, I recollect the hon. gentleman coming down with an increased duty on clocks. He said, I did not bring it in in the first tariff, because we did not know that there were any clocks manufactured in the country, but I have found since that there is a manufactory at Hamilton, where they make a very nice article in, I think, he said, maple cases, which they sell at seventy or eighty cents, and they are exporting them to England, and so we must increase the duty on