

I went back and met my constituents at Moose Jaw—I had never heard in the Northwest a syllable against the duty on binder twine. But after I went back and my friends in that country explained to me how the thing was, what did I do? From the moment I became convinced that it was necessary to deal with the subject of binder twine, I pressed it on the Government, and it was in consequence of my pressure and action that the duty was lowered. It was not in consequence of any action on the part of the Postmaster General, because the Government did not care a snap for that hon. gentleman. If the hon. member for Lisgar will take the hint, let me impress on him now and the other members from the west, that if they will only exert pressure on this Government, we will get something done. What happened in the session of 1891? I moved the motion with regard to second homesteads, which I had been pressing on the Government ever since 1887. Sir John Macdonald, the most powerful politician that ever lived in Canada, and my personal friend as well as political leader, was against it, but that did not prevent my fighting that battle. When Sir John Macdonald was ill, and Sir John Thompson took his place, he was also against it and spoke against it that session of 1891, but that did not prevent my pressing it on. But what did the man do, who, the hon. member for Lisgar says, went back on his own motion? Sir, I divided the House and brought the Government majority down to 14; and I succeeded in obtaining for every farmer in the Territories who wanted it, a second homestead. I succeeded in enabling him to second homestead his pre-emption, and thus put \$400 into his pocket and into the pockets of every homesteader in the west. Yet this man, who blows hot and cold in that newspaper of his own at Winnipeg, according to what he thinks suits his own purpose, and who only came into the House the other day, and who wimples and wobbles around here, putting up bogus motions like the one you have read, he says I do not prove my point. Let me tell what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said when he was in the west, and then—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a point of order. Is it in order for the hon. gentleman to characterize my motion as a bogus motion?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression is, perhaps, not out of order, but I do not think it is an expression that should be used. And I would say the same with regard to another expression that has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), when referring to a member of the House he said "that man."

Mr. DAVIN. Did I say that man? I apologize to the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) for calling him "that man." It shows how

one, in the heat of debate, is apt to forget himself. It would be impossible, with the deepest plummet that ever sounded the depths of the Atlantic to measure the depth of my respect for the hon. member. I am sorry I called him a man. Nothing on this earth would lead me to repeat any such misnomer with regard to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EARLE. You will not do it again?

Mr. DAVIN. No, I will not do it again. I am easily corrected; I am corrigible, and, in that respect, I differ from the hon. member, who is incorrigible. I think that is parliamentary. Now, this is what the present Minister of Agriculture said when he was in the west. Speaking at Moosomin, as you will find in the Moosomin "Spectator" of October 4th, 1894, he said:

Because the United States Congress had made a standing offer of reciprocity in implements, and it was the duty of the Canadian Government to take advantage of that offer. Last year the farmers of western Canada imported \$120,000 worth of American implements, on which they paid \$40,000 duty. Referring to the Massey-Harris combination, he claimed that the fact that these people spoke of going to the States to fight the Yankees in their own market showed that Canadian manufacturers were able to get along without protection. Canadians were able to hold their own with the Yankees in any walk of life. If Massey-Harris got protection, why should not the farmers?

Now, that is exactly what we say. The hon. gentleman says I did not prove my point, though I quoted from the programme of 1893, I quoted the campaign sheet of 1895-96, I quoted his own leader and have just quoted the Minister of Agriculture. Sir, I might have quoted the hon. gentleman himself, because he is aware—and he has the proof in his own pocket—that there is a combine with regard to spades and shovels. He has placed before this House the evidence of that combine. And I say here that it is one of the strongest doctrines of protection that the very minute any industry resorts to a combine, that very minute, in the interests of protection, you should strike at that industry. And he himself, I think, knows that there is actually a combine in agricultural implements as well. One great industry has swallowed up a number of the others, and therefore he is bound, not only by what has taken place in this House, but by his own professions—because I believe his constituency was placarded, "Vote for free agricultural implements"—to take radical action upon that subject.

Let me deal briefly with one argument of the hon. gentleman. Would it be parliamentary to say that my hon. friend is a little fresh? It would not be elegant. I will not say it, therefore. He quoted an argument of mine in reply to the criticisms that though an amended tariff was put forward by the Conservative Government in