

it has been of incalculable benefit to the farmers of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Since we have got back to the question of wool, there is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the House and also of the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is a peculiar method of reasoning that he seems to indulge in, and it is not altogether conclusive. The hon. member for South Huron said: What has your policy done for wool? And he proved to his own satisfaction, no doubt, that it had done nothing for wool; and this was his method of proof: In 1874 there were imported 3,756,556 lbs. of wool; in 1878 there were imported 6,230,084 lbs.—that was at a time when there was no National Policy. See the great increase! But in 1884 there were imported only 6,182,000 lbs., against 6,230,084 in 1878. See the decrease! That is what your policy has done. Now if we are to take that as a conclusive method of reasoning, which selects two single years and compares them, and from that deduces what we must adopt as a truth, we shall be landed in difficulty almost every time. Suppose, for instance, I should adopt the same course of reasoning as that of my hon. friend. Suppose I had been in this House in 1877, I would have said to my friend: See what your policy has done for wool? In 1875 there were imported 7,947,879 lbs. of wool; but in 1877 there were imported only 4,608,825 lbs., a decrease of pretty nearly 3,500,000 of lbs. See what your policy is doing for the wool business. Now what I wish to call the attention of the House to is this: If the hon. gentleman had wished to give a fair statement for the House to make a deduction from, he would have said this: That the average imports of wool, from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, were 5,232,928 lbs., and that the average imports from 1879 to 1884 were 7,753,211 lbs., that is 2,520,283 lbs. on an average per year greater in the latter than in the former period. I am not saying whether we are to draw the conclusion from this that the policy has been successful or not; I am simply pointing out that such reasoning is very inconclusive; and as the hon. member is not correct in regard to his quotations, I think we may well be excused, if we are asked, from the figures given, to arrive at the conclusion that the policy has not been successful.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to refer to one or two remarks made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine). I should be very sorry to misrepresent the hon. gentleman. As to whether his remarks are worthy or unworthy of being quoted, I leave that to himself as the best judge. What I did state was, that he had called the attention of the House on a previous occasion to the fact that a large proportion of certain goods imported into his county was smuggled from the United States. I have no desire to misrepresent him, and in order that there may be no mistake in regard to the hon. gentleman's utterances, I will read a short paragraph from his speech, delivered in 1882, when he enlightened the House with a very long speech, on the grievances of his own particular county and Province. The hon. gentleman discussed the question of cotton and other goods that were imported into his county, and in replying to the Finance Minister, he said:

"Why, I live within four miles of the American boundary, and I have as good a right to know what the retail prices of goods are as any other man in Canada. We are told that our cottons are as cheap as those of the United States markets; but I say, Sir, there is more Yankee cotton used, a large part of it smuggled into Carleton county, than there is of Canadian, and I am willing to let the statement go back to my constituents."

I do not desire to add one single word to that statement. The hon. gentleman having called the attention of the Government to that fact, I, administering one of the Departments whose duty it is to look after these matters, accepted the hon. gentleman's statement, that the largest proportion of the cottons consumed in Carleton was smuggled from the United States.

Mr. McNEIL.

Mr. BLAKE. A large proportion.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, a large part of what is consumed is smuggled into the county. I am always glad to receive information, particularly in a public manner, from hon. gentlemen opposite, that smuggling to any extent is going on in any portion of the country; and when hon. gentlemen give me such information I deem it my duty to use it, just the same as I use any information given, either privately or in any other way, by instructing collectors of Customs and those whose duty it is to look after and protect the revenue, to see that the practice of smuggling a large portion of any particular fabric or article is not continued. If a large quantity of goods imported by the hon. gentleman's constituents has been seized, I have to thank him for the information he gave me; and I can assure him that so long as I occupy my present position I shall be very glad to receive any information on that point, either privately, or publicly in this House, and I can assure the hon. gentleman I will act upon that information immediately. The hon. gentleman is quite right in his statement that the return moved for by the leader of the Opposition does not convey a correct idea of the number of seizures made, either in his county or anywhere else. The return gave the information asked for by that hon. gentleman; and I will add here, parenthetically, that I would be very glad, on any future occasion, when motions are made in regard to smuggling, that such motion should be so worded as to cover all the cases and penalties, whether by confiscation of goods or fines imposed, or enclosures, or undervaluation, or anything else, and I will bring the return down. I throw out this hint because I hope that any member who moves for such a return in future will ask for the causes of the imposition of any fines, more particularly if names are to be given. For this reason. A merchant may have enclosures of which he is altogether ignorant and for which no possible blame can attach to him; and yet, if a return is brought down to the House, simply setting forth that a certain merchant had his goods seized, without giving reasons why they were seized, it might mislead those who read the statement, and it would appear that an honest man had been guilty of wrong, when such was not really the fact. I have made this explanation, and will be more cautious, if the hon. gentleman thinks it necessary, in future, to quote his exact words. I desire briefly to reply to the hon. member for Bothwell, who asked me the question as to what position woollen rags would be in when the items were struck out of the list. They will be placed then among the unenumerated articles, and consequently will bear 20 per cent., unless we should specially place them in another class. There is another question, however. The question has been raised, as to whether an article having been placed on the free list by an Order in Council, the Governor in Council has power to repeal it, and in conversation with my colleagues on that question, I said it was my intention to introduce a short Bill in reference to the Customs Act, in which I should take power to remove any doubt upon that point. I remember that my hon. friend, the ex-Finance Minister, called our attention to that point.

Mr. IRVINE. The Minister of Customs is well aware that the smuggling of cotton goods is but a small proportion of the smuggling that is going on in the various parts of Canada. I say there is a portion of the community who make a living by smuggling, and that does not apply to the inhabitants of my own county more than to the inhabitants of other counties in Canada. I am glad to find that for once the Minister of Customs pays so much attention to my remonstrances and advice. I have remonstrated with him on another matter, when he did not pay so much attention to me. A few years ago I asked information from the Department as to the appointment of a seizing officer in my