

made, had risen so enormously that these people had to sell at a higher rate. That story and that explanation might do for those who knew no better. We all know that the manilla out of which the binder twine was manufactured was imported into Canada before the war in the Philippine Islands took place, and could not by any means have affected the price of the raw material out of which the binder twine was made. Since that time there has been a war, and the industry of that country has fallen off to a very great extent, and there may be a reason this year why it is higher than it was last year, but that reason did not exist at the time this explanation was given, and consequently the government enabled the favoured contractors to put a large amount of money—from sixty to a hundred thousands dollars of actual profit it is said—in their own pockets at the expense of those down-trodden farmers of whom we heard so much before these gentlemen came into power. I must admit, and I congratulate my hon. friend opposite on the fact, that the roasting, if I may use that expression, which the leader of the government got last year for the manner in which they disposed of binder twine manufactured in the penitentiary, has led him to adopt another plan this year, namely, advertising throughout the whole country for applications to be made for the purchase of the output of the penitentiary. That is the course that should be pursued upon all occasions, and when the twine is sold there is no reason why this country should not know the price obtained for it. This is a question which I might continue to discuss and elaborate for hours, but I shall confine myself more particularly to some other portions of the address which is before me. I must express my great gratification at the ultimate decision come to by the government in reference to the Transvaal difficulty, but if any precedent for the course that has been pursued can be found in history, I should be very glad to have this Senate informed of it by the hon. gentleman who leads this House, the hon. Minister of Justice, who is a recognized authority on historical questions. In the first place when hostilities broke out, the leader of the opposition in the Commons addressed the Prime Minister of this coun-

try and pledged his party to support the government if they would take steps to render assistance to the mother country. Instead of meeting that offer in a proper spirit, the proposition having been made by the leader of the opposition in a patriotic manner, in a manner that should receive the commendation of every loyal subject in this country, he was snubbed, and I do think that I am not using too strong language when I say that the Premier's reply to him was not of that dignified character which should characterize the utterances of the Prime Minister of this country. Without telling him what he thought he could not do, he volunteered the expression that he was not to be expected to be more loyal than the Queen herself. I cannot possibly conceive why an answer of that kind should have been given. Then we find, immediately afterwards, the Premier, we have reason to believe, seeking an interview with the reporter of a leading ministerial journal giving his views as to why he should not act upon the suggestion which had been made by Sir Charles Tupper, and he tells him that he had studied the militia law—he had looked through its provisions, and that they had no power whatever to send people out of the country, and that they had no authority other than that which could be given by parliament to expend money for any such purpose. The constitutional point raised by the Premier at the time no one would dispute in theory, but there are periods in the history of all countries when the government, and particularly a responsible government, take upon themselves the responsibility of acting, trusting to the good sense and loyalty of the people's representatives in the parliament to pass either an Act of Indemnity or to sustain the government in the course which they had taken. Then we find them some little time afterwards, after a despatch had been received from the Imperial government, authorizing the enrolment of 1,000 volunteers. Upon that, one of his most intimate friends, personally and politically, resigned his position in the House of Commons in condemnation of the course which the Liberal government had pursued. We find another gentleman, the representative of Laprairie (Mr. Monet) declaring that he was opposed to the enrol-