

agricultural implement makers deserved raw material free, the farmers were as much entitled to raw material free of duty as they were. This was their cry on this question in 1896. But something took place since. The Minister of the Interior is now a cabinet minister; possibly that fact and the \$7,000 he receives annually may have changed his views. There is, I think, another reason. He has been touring in the east with the manufacturers of those implements. He was, I believe, in the company of the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost), when he made that celebrated speech wherein he declared that the tariff was a dead issue, which produced such consternation among his friends in the west that they took him to task, inquiring how he could make so foolish a statement as that. Well, he was reported in the Liberal papers, and no one has denied the report, as saying: Yes, I did say that the tariff was a dead issue between the political parties, because the Tories have come round to our way of thinking on the question. A more simple and puerile explanation never fell from the mouth of man, let alone a cabinet minister, and I fear the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville is responsible for inoculating the Minister of the Interior with a good deal of his protectionist theories. He comes back now, but he does not say that 20 per cent is an outrageously high protective tariff, but he says: Gentlemen, when I was speaking in 1896, I was entirely ignorant of what I was telling you, or I was deliberately deceiving you. He must say either one of these things or the other, he cannot avoid one issue or the other. He now claims that far from the 20 per cent duty being a protective duty, it is not even a revenue tariff. He states that while the manufacturers of Canada have to pay 35 per cent on their raw material, the manufacturers on the other side of the line can send the finished product in for 20 per cent. The only deduction you can draw from this is, that, in order to make this duty a revenue tariff it would require to be raised another 15 per cent, making it what it was prior to 1894. The 20 per cent tariff was a protective tariff in 1896, while now it is not even a revenue tariff. When hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House attempted to explain their position, and when it was stated that year after year had gone by and no reduction had been made on agricultural implements while the duty upon the raw material entering into them has been reduced, he tells them not to look upon these questions from a narrow provincial standpoint, but from that broad Dominion standpoint that the hon. minister looks upon them himself. It was in his spirit of narrow sectionalism, that, in 1896, the hon. Minister of the Interior asked the people of Manitoba to strike down the Tory candidates because,

if the Liberals get into power they would have free agricultural implements. I do not know what the Prime Minister must have thought of the indiscretion of the hon. Minister of the Interior touching the question of the duty on lumber when, for the purpose of self-laudation, the hon. Minister of the Interior told the people at Brandon that a deputation came down to Ottawa and waited upon the government that they were representing millions of dollars, that they had more power and influence in the constituencies than the whole province of Manitoba would be worth to the Liberal party, that they declared that they would give the government twelve months to put a large duty on lumber, and that if they did not do it they would support the hon. leader of the opposition. To say the least of it the hon. Minister of the Interior was divulging cabinet secrets. He said: I was called in, and I told the Prime Minister that if this were to be made the policy of the government I might as well write out my resignation. Then, of course, the whole fabric would tumble to the ground, the keystone being removed, so the coon came down. He states that every member of the government would be politically benefited by the imposition of a duty on lumber except himself. Is this a case of the tail wagging the dog, or Napoleon ordering his subalterns to duty their duty and obey his commands. It seems that tariff questions are decided not so much in the interest of the people as in regard to political exigencies.

What has been the policy of the government in regard to the binder twine industry? The House will remember that when the late Sir John Thompson was Minister of Justice it was claimed that a large binder twine combine had been formed in the Dominion of Canada to increase the price of binder twine. Our prairies were becoming more thickly populated, a greater acreage was brought under cultivation every year, and an increasingly large supply of binder twine was required by our farmers. Sir John Thompson installed a plant in the Kingston penitentiary for the purpose of giving the farmers cheaper binder twine, which they did receive during the time of the Conservative administration. But, when our Liberal friends came into power they disposed of this twine, from year to year to their own political friends, to such men as Hobbs, of London, who was a member of the combine, and who held up the farmers, to Bate, of Ottawa, who, if not a member of the combine himself, disposed of his purchase to Hobbs, and it was controlled by the combine. These men, playing into each other's hands and into the hands of members of the combine held up the farmers and extorted from them hundreds of thousands of dollars out of their pockets more than they should have been called upon to pay. Yet, hon. gentlemen say that they are giving a great boon to the farmers because they are