

by his eloquence. He had appealed to the electors in the name of chivalry and decency and fair play to return a government supporter, explaining to them how much easier it would be for such an one to obtain the ear of his ministers. I may say in passing that with one exception I have had no difficulty whatever in obtaining the ear of the right hon. gentleman's ministers, and in that one case it was probably that the particular minister was so extremely busy that I was unable at the times I tried to get in contact with him. My opponent's agent had made his headquarters in the hotel in Penticton and had displayed a very considerable amount of hospitality, which I think had been appreciated. Three or four days before polling, the Liberal organizer in the west—that I think is his title—Mr. Turgeon, called on the president of the Penticton Board of Trade and said something like this: "Mr. Boyle, I want to obtain the support of the Board of Trade of Penticton and I assure you that if Penticton will give a majority for the government candidate I will pledge myself, on behalf of the Liberal party, to the building of a post office in Penticton," Mr. Boyle, who is a Conservative, asked what he could do and Mr. Turgeon replied, "I am not appealing to you as an individual but as President of the Board of Trade. Call your executive together and put my proposition before them." Mr. Boyle called together his executive, who also were all Conservatives, and he solemnly placed this suggestion before them. Penticton was good enough to give me a majority; Penticton did not get a post office. I place this incident on record in duty to the electors of Yale, because messy dirtinesses of this description are repugnant to a very great majority of those electors. Their desire is that the decencies of private life should enter into and dominate the public life of this country.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Cape Breton South and Richmond): In discussing the subjects suggested by the budget and the speeches made in this debate, I desire to touch briefly upon a reference made to me by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Harris) in his address yesterday afternoon. In speaking of the proposal of the government to form a tariff board the hon. gentleman pointed out that in 1912 the government then in office also had a proposition before parliament to create a tariff board and he added that certain members now in the House of Commons supporting the present government and who were then in opposition had voted against that resolution. He proceeded to charge those members, including my-

self, with inconsistency if we dared support the proposal of this government. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that his statement as to my having opposed the proposition of the government in 1912 to establish a tariff board is perfectly correct. I opposed it on the ground that the high protectionist government then in office ought not to be entrusted with the creation of a tariff board. The hon. member for East York could have found the reasons why I and other members sitting on this side of the House voted against that proposition. He would also find that the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)—who now sits with him—spoke and voted against it for the same reason.

And why did I not have confidence in a tariff board established by the government then in office? Because, only three weeks after that government came into power, by a new interpretation which they arbitrarily placed upon a certain clause in the customs tariff they removed from the free list an article that had been in use by the fishermen of the Maritime provinces for some twelve years and put it in the class of dutiable articles subject to a duty of 25 per cent. I refer to barked marline. In 1898, after the Liberal party came into office, in the course of revising the tariff they placed certain articles upon the free list, included among them being nets, twines, ropes and barked marline. Our fishermen enjoyed that privilege, as I say, from 1898 to 1912 when the new Minister of Customs under the Conservative government, owing to influences being brought to bear by the manufactures of cordage, made this arbitrary ruling a few weeks after he came into office, thus depriving our fishermen of the privilege of buying at a cheaper rate this article which they required in the carrying on of their business.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the only case. Rough lumber was also admitted under the free list from 1898 onwards, being enumerated as sawn lumber, while manufactured lumber was in the class of lumber having one side planed or "edged" as it is called. The lumber dealers in western Canada came to Ottawa at about the same time as the manufacturers of cordage came, and they pointed out to the new Minister of Customs that this rough lumber ought not to be admitted free any longer, that while the edges of the boards were not planed they were sawn with so fine a saw as to amount almost to being planed, and therefore should be subjected to a duty of \$2 per thousand feet; whereupon that duty was imposed. The purchasers of that class of lumber, I think it was in the province of