

actions which this unprincipled combination could put upon them in the shape of raising the price of their binder twine. That is something that should be avoided. I do not believe the hon. gentlemen meant to ask the House to adopt what is contained in their resolution, and in order that we may come to their rescue, I propose this amendment. The combinsters will set the price of their article at 5 or 10 per cent profit, because they have 10 or 20 per cent profit upon the raw material, and they are prepared for twelve or twenty-four months to sell below cost, in order to obtain the market. They will have a sliding scale to go upon, and the government, being bound hand and foot, will not be able to aid the farmers by competition. I will move in amendment, if it is the desire of the farmers to have competition between the government factory and the private operator, to add these three words after the word 'with,' in the 5th line: 'not more than,' so that it will read: 'with not more than one cent per pound added.' That will give an opportunity to the government to act upon the good old rule of trade, to supply the article according to the demand, and regulate the price by the competition which will take place throughout the country. If this is to be the desire, honestly expressed, with no intention to embarrass the government, or to produce any political effect, with a sliding scale by which the government can compete with others, the price of binder twine, before twelve months have passed, will be reduced one-half to the farmers of the country, and they will reap all the benefit.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, it would be hardly expected that I should remain quiet while a subject of so much magnitude was being discussed in this House. Representing, as I do, a constituency in which there are two binder twine factories, you would naturally suppose that I should know something about the subject of binder twine.

Mr. GANONG. Are you a shareholder also?

Mr. HEYD. I am sorry to say that the hon. gentlemen who have discussed this question, have discussed it without that intimate knowledge of the binder twine business that is absolutely necessary in order to have an intelligent comprehension of the subject that is now before us. In order to relieve the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Ganong), who fancies that I may have a financial object in view, I may tell him that I have not a five-cent piece of interest in any binder twine establishment in this country, but, while I have no personal interest in binder twine, I have the interest in the binder twine industry that every Canadian citizen should have, and I am free to confess that the only words that

appeal to my mind that were addressed by the speaker from the other side, were those in which he condemned the government for taking off the duty on binder twine. With those words I sincerely agree. I think it was a mistake. I believe that the binder twine industry, like every other industry in this country, should be protected from undue competition from outside, and that it, like every other industry, should have the right to live in this country of ours. I believe that this industry, like every other, should be made to pay a duty on every pound of twine that comes into this country. I agree with our friends on the other side in that. Now, then, I approach the subject not as a politician, not with a desire to embarrass the government, not with a desire to contradict a truthful word that may have been spoken by hon. gentlemen opposite, but I approach it as a business proposition. We are manufacturing twine at the Kingston penitentiary, and how are we going to handle that product in such a way as to result in the greatest benefit to the consumers of binder twine, and at the same time to produce it at the least cost to the taxpayers of this country. I propose to approach that business question as a business man, and I shall try to put myself in the position of a man who is going to invest his money in that concern with the expectation of realizing a reasonable dividend out of his investment. The speeches made by gentlemen on the other side of the House have been apparently made for the purpose of discrediting the government, and of appealing to the prejudices, and sometimes to the parsimony of our farming friends. The question arises here as to what consuming power we have in this country for binder twine. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that last year there was entered for consumption in Ontario 3,900,000 pounds of binder twine, at 12 cents a pound; in the province of Manitoba 3,400,000 pounds at 10 cents a pound, and in the whole Dominion there were 8,000,000 pounds of twine entered at 11 cents a pound. The prices given are from the invoices of the merchants, who swore to them when the twine was entered. Let us deal with a proposition which represents an importation of 8,000,000 pounds of binder twine, or 4,000 tons. Now, according to the calculations of those familiar with the subject that 4,000 tons is about five-tenths of the total quantity consumed in Canada, or in other words, we import about half the actual quantity used. Eight million pounds of binder twine are imported from the United States, and that comes into direct competition with the twine that is manufactured in this country, which amounts to another 4,000 tons, including the product of the Kingston and Toronto prisons. Let us realize that the government manufacture of twine would represent