

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The especial work is in the eastern states, to bring them back, if possible, to the province of Quebec.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister does not seem to have any special anxiety to-night to pass his estimates, taking advantage of the opportunity to make what we may call a purely political speech, in fact drifting away into the question of the tariff. I do not think the hon. minister was quite fair to the hon. member for Centre Toronto; when the Minister of Customs prompted him he said that by bringing in immigration he was increasing the number of consumers. He is spending a very large amount every year for the purpose of getting more consumers, but consumers of what? Consumers of Canadian manufactured goods? Why, the policy of the government is diametrically opposed to that. Its policy is to force us to expend large sums of money every year in order to bring people into Canada to consume foreign goods and for the purpose of enabling foreign goods to come in—the goods that might be made in this country just as well as in Europe. These goods are allowed to come in at a low rate of duty in opposition to our own productions, and to supply the demands of people whom it costs us over \$600,000 to bring into Canada. We are simply spending our money to bring people into the country to make a market for the goods, manufactured in the old country. The Minister of the Interior says that what the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) wants, is an increase in our duties. I would like to ask him if he knows how much the government has decreased the duties. When he went through Manitoba in 1900, he told the people that they were to have free binder twine, free barbwire, free coal oil and free clothing. They were going to get practically everything free, and he was bringing people from the old country, at a very large expense, into Canada in order that they might have those free goods. I wonder does the hon. minister know that the government has not practically reduced taxation one fraction of a cent. I am sure the Minister of Customs knows it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I am afraid he does not know the first principles of his own department, because there can be no question about the fact that the average rate of duty on goods dutiable and free has not been decreased, since the Liberal party came into power.

Mr. HEYD. Nonsense.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman is only showing his ignorance. He can never have investigated the matter.

An hon. MEMBER. What about binder twine?

Mr. MONET.

Mr. HENDERSON. Binder twine is made free, but the duty is put up on something else. Only two years ago the hon. the Minister of Finance told us that he never intended to reduce taxation. There seems to be a division in the government. One member says a reduction has been made; another says he never intended to make a reduction. But any man who has investigated the figures will find that the Minister of Finance has carried out his policy literally and has not reduced taxation.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman then disagrees with his leader?

Mr. HENDERSON. My hon. friend can speak after I sit down and I will listen to him with the greatest of pleasure. I maintain that as high a rate of taxation is in force to-day as in the last five or six years of the Conservative regime.

Mr. HEYD. That is nonsense.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for Brant may say that is nonsense, but he is only giving evidence of how little he knows. The government adopted the system of reducing the duty on one article but taking care to make good the revenue by raising the duty on another article. They reduced the duties on the articles we can make, which we have the machinery and the labour to make, and then turned around and increased the duties on what we could not produce, thus compelling the people to pay a heavy tax on what we cannot produce and making it more difficult for the people to produce what we can. The policy is entirely wrong.

Mr. MONET. I rise to a point of order. We are not on the budget debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Some hon. members have drifted far away from the estimates. To a certain extent the tariff may be discussed, for instance as a reason why we are not getting people to come in and remain with us, but I hope that hon. gentlemen will not go into the details of the tariff and discuss how much duty was taken off or put on various articles.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am perfectly willing to submit to your ruling, Sir, but whether I was in order or not I was following the example of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and he should have been called to account first. I shall not proceed further than to emphasize what I have said. If I had not told some unpalatable truths to hon. gentlemen on that side they would not have interjected so many interruptions, but they felt that there was too much force in what I did say and took this means to try and weaken it. As you have ruled, Sir, that it is the estimates we are discussing, and not the fiscal policy of the country, I hope the hon. minister will not endeavour to interject a political discussion on the tariff where you think it is not called for.