

84,724 pounds extra standard at 10½ cents and 10¼ cents.

It does not look as if they sacrificed very much if they sold the binder twine at those figures.

Mr. SPROULE. What year was that ?

Mr. HEYD. That is in the Auditor General's Report of last year.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) has given me the opportunity to put this properly before the House. I turn to the sessional papers for 1902-3, volume XXXVII, No. 1, and I find there the statement of sales presented by the Auditor General :

Maple leaf (pure manilla), 17,325 pounds at 10 cents.

Mixed manilla (Monarch)—

6,783 pounds at 10½ cents.

12,960 pounds at 10¼ cents.

12,905 pounds at 10 cents.

220,000 pounds at 5 1-10 cents.

Sisal—

1,358 pounds at 9½ cents.

8,000 pounds at 9¼ cents.

15,905 pounds at 9 cents.

200,065 pounds at 6¼ cents.

60,025 pounds at 4½ cents.

Now, I think that is pretty conclusive proof that the American trust controls the price of binder twine in Canada, and that this has been the case since the duty was removed. And if the trust has charged the people more than is legitimate, what excuse is there for the government? The Minister of Justice states, they are selling this twine at a small advance on cost. But I ask what justification is there for selling the great bulk of it for half the price to jobbers at which it is sold to the farmers? He has not explained that, and I will give him an opportunity to do so.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The whole thing was explained while the hon. gentleman (Mr. T. I. Thomson) was out of the chamber a few minutes ago.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. I have quoted from the Auditor General's Report in the sessional papers of 1903, showing the sales made in the previous years. This is not for 1896.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this be adopted ?

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. I think the Minister of Justice should give some explanation. This is a very serious charge.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, not at all serious.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. The combination were charging more for the twine than is legitimate and the government were charging as much as the combination. Of course there was no object in the farmer buying from the government. Yet, when the gov-

ernment could not sell their twine owing to the high price asked by the government, they sold it to their friends at low prices, and the farmer had to pay the combination price when he purchased from their friends.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know that it is proper, at this stage of the session, to expect a transaction to be explained twice over because it suits the convenience of an hon. gentleman to step out into the lobby while the explanation is being given. I explained that in this House a resolution was passed directing that the binder twine should be sold to the farmers exclusively. As a result a large part of it remained on our hands at the end of the season. We decided to dispose of this by tender, and the tenders were called for and the twine sold. The question was investigated the next year while my estimates were before the Committee of Supply. I discussed the whole matter and the resolution was cancelled and instructions given that the Department of Justice should be left free to dispose of the binder twine in the ordinary way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved to insert after the words 'for sale' in subsection 2, the words 'in Canada;' also to change the word 'confiscated' to the word 'seized.'

Amendments agreed to.

Bill as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION OF GRAIN.

House in committee on Bill (No. 113) respecting the inspection of grain.—Sir Richard Cartwright.

On section 2,

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the chairman of the committee has gone carefully over the Bill since it was reprinted, and says he has found it correct with the amendments made by the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I have gone carefully over the Bill. There are just a few verbal amendments to make the Bill readable, but no material change. The Bill was carefully considered; the committee spent eleven days over it, and I think it is pretty nearly perfect.

On section 4,

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is one change here, adding after the words 'in his division' the words 'or divisions.'

Mr. HENDERSON. That is in view of having one chief inspector for the whole.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

On section 52,

The inspection fees upon grain within the several districts shall be paid by the inspec-