

I found three classes, with all kinds of limitations and exceptions. Heinz's 57 varieties are not in it with these tariff schedules. There has been a reclassification; the old classes have been split and doubled up and rearranged until now we have a regular Chinese puzzle. I am glad that just to-day we have had placed in our hands some tables of comparative rates which may help us a little in coming to some conclusion with regard to this budget. In passing, I would suggest that the enforcement of these very highly technical classifications will require a small army of technical experts. As I read these tariff schedules I find them full of jokers, although this is not altogether new; there are grades specified, certain qualities, special makes, dates of applications and drawbacks. I admit that there are some concessions in the interests of the consumers at large, but on the other hand I note that decreases are often offset by increases. In some instances there are decreases on articles of minor importance; for example, I notice that braided candle wick now comes in free, while on the other hand there are large concessions to the electrical interests. I suppose that since we no longer live in the age of candles we can afford to be generous with those who still use them, but when it comes to modern systems of lighting and electrical appliances, that is another matter. Further, there are decreases where there is practically no importation; there are decreases in manufacturers' supplies, perhaps especially as these relate to mining and refining. I was rather interested to note that press blankets are now on the free list; I suppose that helps out the newspaper syndicates, but I cannot see why press blankets should be free while horse blankets are not free. I notice that the rate on wrapping for paper has been reduced, but I do not see why this should not be manufactured in Canada by the paper makers themselves. In some instances there are discriminations against the small manufacturers. In my own city of Winnipeg we have some cap and hat manufacturers; I do not know just how this is going to affect them, but it would seem to me that they will be hard hit.

As far as I can judge, without being an expert in the matter, there seems to be no rhyme or reason to the construction of this tariff. There are special concessions in evidence on every page. I am reminded of a time when I was a child, when my mother's mending basket was upset; in it were spools of thread, balls of yarn, tape, and a great variety of other articles. Some little kittens began to play with the contents of that basket, and perhaps you can imagine the mess there was

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

left when they finishel, and the snarls and tangles which resulted from their fun. This tariff is very similar; there have been all sorts of pulls by various people who have had a hand in it, but I really do not know who will untangle the tariff; I hardly think parliament is likely to do it.

Mr. NEILL: Who are the kittens?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not like to accuse the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) of being kittenish in his actions, but he has had a part in it, and I fancy a great many people who frequent his office have had an even greater part. In view of this very difficult question, I am inclined to take my opinion from those closer in touch with the situation, so I go to the Montreal Gazette, which says:

The Minister of Finance maintains his reputation as a safe and sound administrator.

I presume there are good grounds for saying that. Further, the Gazette editorial states:

With regard to the revision of the textile group, it is largely departmental, and further, the general effect of this will be, it is thought, favourable to the industry whose case for relief was fully made out two years ago.

According to the Gazette apparently the industry is to profit and is to obtain relief, instead of that relief being given to the general public. Then I turn to another financial paper, the Financial Post, which has the following to say:

The tariff changes announced in the budget are more important as a low tariff gesture than for the effect they will have on business.

I would commend that statement to some of the hon. gentlemen directly opposite. In this connection I was reminded of an article which I read a few months ago in the April number of the Atlantic Monthly, called "The Money Power in Politics" and written by Mr. William B. Munro. Mr. Munro is a firm believer in the money power, and hence his admissions are rather interesting. He speaks of Mr. Elihu Root's phrase, "our invisible government" and says that:

All governments, wheresoever they operate, are subject to the pressure of invisible influences. This pressure is unrelenting; it comes from many quarters; it is exerted upon voters, legislatures, executives, and courts alike; and its sources are often so well concealed as to be unrecognizable even by those against whom it is directed."

Again he says:

The motive power in law making is supplied from somewhere outside the legislative halls.

And again:

These interest groups, as we call them, work for the most part within the ranks of the