

The whole point he was discussing, as I got it, was as to whether some particular way of stating the case for protection had been adopted by Lincoln. Well perhaps the quotation used was the way Lincoln stated it, perhaps it was not, I am not going to climb the archaeological tree to find out; it is sufficient for me to know that Lincoln supported protection, I am not particularly interested in just how he put the case.

Mr. HOEY: The quotation was often used in the campaign of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No doubt there were many who attributed it to Lincoln, and I notice that all those who did not were opposed to protection themselves. But it is much more important to have the authority of a man like Lincoln, a man of intense patriotism, of deep human sympathies and of great practical wisdom—better far to have his authority from the practice of his life than to have the exact phraseology in which he defended his belief. We used to hear for many years—usually from the former hon. member for Red Deer, Mr. Clark, the opinions also of John Stuart Mill. The case is now taken up by the member for Springfield, and he protests against any inference that John Stuart Mill would support a protective policy in America for any period longer than twenty years after the time he lived. Well, I join with the hon. member in respect for the names of great thinkers and philosophers, of the past. As for Mill I certainly would have regard for his opinion as respects an economic question, as to what principle should be applied to conditions as he saw them and was able to study them. But when it comes to asking me to accept the opinion of Mill as to what would be right as applied to conditions a quarter of a century, or a century afterwards, the draft on my veneration is too heavy.

Mr. HOEY: Does the hon. member know that I was simply replying to an argument of one of his own members.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He was referring to what an hon. member had said, that Mill, observing conditions in America as he did would favour, or at least would not object to, a protective system there. I say I respect Mills' opinion as applied to conditions within his knowledge, but when he speaks of what would suit conditions away in the future, I must be permitted to appeal from the predictions of the last century to the facts of to-day.

The hon. member quoted a letter from a former member of this House, a most re-

spected man, actually proving that we have some industries running in Canada yet. I do not know that any one disputes the fact. We have, as respects most industries in this Dominion, a protective system yet. We have a more or less serious invasion now, a tendency and a constant threatening and warning which does infinite harm;—but we have industries yet. I made inquiries as to those woollen factories to which the hon. gentleman referred, and, my information is that the product of one or both, is a particular line of material as respects which there is no serious, if any, competition from the Old World. These also have some protection.

Mr. HOEY: That would not apply to cream separators which I quoted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not to a cream separator. The hon. gentleman turns the cream separator handle year after year. But there is something worthy of remark in this connection as well. Do not rely too much on the cream separator when you are managing a Dominion. It happens to be a specially intricate mechanism the manufacture of which depends on special patents, and thereby enjoys protection of another kind which renders it not so necessary to have the regular rule apply. But I want to tell the hon. member that, from the mouth of the manufacturer himself, I have been frequently told that the difference between the cost of manufacture of a free trade cream separator and the price the farmer pays is bigger than it is in respect of any implements protected by the tariff to-day. He mentioned also one or two factories which had closed, and criticised their management. He did not like the salaries that had been paid. I did not gather very fully just what he was trying to show, but I did gather this; that the man who drew the salary also had a very considerable stock interest, and I would imagine if it were possible for him to continue the business and save his stock he would likely do so. He evidently found it was an impossibility. I never before heard his capacity as a business man impugned. Indeed in other industries he has been successful. According to the hon. member, the business failed, not because of lack of business, but because of lack of money. This is usually the cause of most businesses failing.

Reviewing some other remarks of the hon. member, I was rather astonished to find that he followed a very bad precedent in respect of immigration figures. He has placed on Hansard now the figures of the migration from Canada to the United States, as reported by the Immigration Department of Washing-