

hon. gentleman for North Grey could have told you if he had chosen to do so that long wools are made into black lustres and goods of that description, and he could also tell you that in 1874 he sold 100 pieces of lustre to one piece that he sells to-day. The reason is that people have ceased to wear that class of goods; they have gone out of fashion; and consequently long wool has largely gone out of use. However, but for the fact that they have gone into the manufacture of blankets and other articles, long wools would be much lower in price than they are to-day; so that the farmers are indebted to the National Policy for keeping up the price of long wools to-day.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wigle) began with a perfectly correct statement of facts, and wound up with a very inconclusive deduction from them. It is quite true that the reduction in the price of long wools is due to the fact that they have gone out of fashion; but when he says the National Policy has prevented them from going still lower in Canada, I cannot agree with him. When we consider that long wool is not imported, his conclusion from the facts he stated appear absurd. He says that South Down wool is from 27 to 30 cents a pound. Well, it has been up to that price during the last year, but it is quoted in to-day's *Mail* at 22 cents. But if it was 30 cents to-day, and we did not grow enough short wool to supply the home market, whatever duty the Government put on it would raise the price so much per pound, and the farmer would gain so much benefit from it. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have become converted to their views, because we are urging that the farmer should have as much protection as everybody else. That is absurd. All that we ask is that they should carry out the scheme they promised in 1878, and make this protection fair all round. We know that if they did all prices would be raised equally and nobody would be better off, and that would only show the absurdity of the policy they have embarked in. They have entered on the absurd task of helping everybody by increasing the price of what everybody has to sell but they stop short with increasing the price of goods to some classes to the disadvantage of the rest. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle) has a crushing proof of the correctness of our views. He has told us that the Weston Mills near Toronto had formerly to import shoddy from England. There was not any shoddy to be had in Canada in the days of the revenue tariff; rags were not plentiful enough; but now, he says, we use home made rags. They keep thirty or forty girls and a countless number of men employed collecting these rags throughout the country. The hon. gentleman has proved that the most flourishing industry in Canada to-day is the rag and shoddy industry. That is just the conclusion to which we thought this policy would come, and I am glad to hear a frank admission of it from the hon. and honourable gentleman. If this great increase in the production and consumption of Canadian rags has taken place in the absence of any duty on the imported article, what will be the result when these rags are placed on the duty list? My heart swells with pride when I think of the tremendous shoddy industry that will grow up in Canada in a year or two, through the operation of this duty! My hon. friend showed that the people were not fairly dealt with in the price of rags; that they are only paid 2 cents per pound, while, according to the Trade Returns, the average price of imported rags is something like 12 cents, so that the woollen manufacturer gives the Canadian only a sixth of the price for his rags that he gives the outsider.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). These are unsorted rags.

Mr. CASEY. I do not understand anything about assorted rags; that is a part of the National Policy I have not gone into. The hon. gentleman told us he bought wool

under the régime of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) for 25 cents per pound. I do not remember, in my own neighborhood, any year when we could get wool as low as that—that is washed wool—which is the standard we ought to take; but I remember several years when we got 40, 50 and 60 cents a pound for it. The hon. gentleman says that although wool is much cheaper; cloth is also much cheaper. Yes; shoddy cloth. The importation of shoddy has increased the production of Canadian shoddy, and very cheap clothing can now be produced and sold to the farmers; but the farmer is sold as well as the cloth. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) told us how shoddy cloth is made—tied together with a little Canadian wool. In concluding, I want to call attention to the fact that the price of wool was thought to be a grievance as long ago as 1878. On the 2nd of July of that year, during the elections, the *Mail* took the following extract from the *Sarnia Canadian* :—

"The price of wool this year is one of the farmers' tribulations. For the very best wool he only gets 22 cents, while across the river the price is 32 cents. Our wool growers are entirely at the mercy of the Yankees, and our Government does not protect our farmers, and wool is allowed to come into Canada free of duty. A Government that would submit to such injustice does not deserve the confidence of the people."

Well, to-day, with the price of wool ranging from 15 to 18 cents a pound, I can echo the words, that "the farmers are at the mercy of the Yankees and the Government that would submit to such injustice does not deserve the confidence of the people."

Mr. CHARLTON. The quotations I gave were called in question by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). Well, the following appears in the Chicago report of the *Globe* to-day :

"Forbes & Co. received the following dispatch to-day from Chicago over their private wires; there is no perceptible change in the freight rates although it is reported that they are firmer, because of a scarcity of cars. Wheat—puts 80½; calls 84½ cents.

Mr. DUNDAS. What term of delivery?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not familiar with the terms of the stock market to say, but when I gave quotations I stated that wheat on call was 84½. If the statement of the hon. gentleman was correct, and wheat was worth 77 cents in Chicago and 83 in Toronto, the difference would not pay half the freight; consequently, even at that price wheat was higher in Chicago than in Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE (York). In the same paragraph that the hon. member read from the report of Forbes & Co., received by private wire, he will see that wheat, on March the 26th, was 77½; lowest, 76½. When the hon. gentleman stated the prices in the papers to-day, he gave this House most distinctly to understand that they were the prices selling in Chicago to-day. If not, what point was there in his comparison of Toronto and Chicago prices, the one of March and the other in June. The hon. gentleman would ask us to believe he does not know the meaning of puts and calls; but if not, he should not have quoted the paragraph. Calls may give the selling price months hence; we all know the quotations in Chicago are given months in advance, and that wheat delivered next May is higher than to-day's delivery; that June is higher still, and July still higher. The hon. gentleman, when he quoted, should have given quotations for to-day's sales.

Mr. CHARLTON. Whether I understand the meaning of puts and calls or not, I stated, when I made the quotations, that the price was 84½ cents in Chicago on call. If I did not understand that, the hon. member for York did. I repeat the price of 77 cents in Chicago is relatively higher than 77 cents in Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not agree that the price in Chicago of 77 cents is as high as the price in Toronto at 83 cents. It has been repeatedly stated that the freight