

in Canada have not been living up to the law, and whether the large quantity of binder twine imported into this country has been found to be up to the standard manufactured by the Canadian people.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He has made a report, and, so far as he can discover up to the present date, the twine manufactured corresponds with the regulations imposed by the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister bring down his report?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. minister had appointed an inspector to see that the manufacturers did not make over 100 per cent profit, he might be of some value to the Canadian farmers. If the hon. gentleman will turn up 'Hansard' of July 29, he will find that the Minister of Justice gave the prices that were paid for pure manilla each year since 1893, and if he will look at the report made by the late Minister of Justice, he will find that twine can be manufactured for $\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound. To that add the cost of the manilla, and a reasonable profit, and you will have the price at which the inspector should see that the twine is sold to the farmers. Double it, if you like, and you will see that the farmers have paid a good deal more. Mr. Clarke, of Toronto, asked:

What was the average price per pound paid each year since 1893 by the government of Canada for manilla used in the manufacture of binder twine at the Kingston penitentiary?

The Minister of Justice stated in reply that in 1893 there was none purchased: in 1894 the price was \$4.38 per cwt. Add 75 cents for manufacturing, and you have 5 cents per pound. In 1894 twine was sold to the farmers for about $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents. In 1895 the cost of manilla was \$4.13; in 1896, \$4.46; in 1897, \$4.26. In 1897 the farmers of Canada paid about 13 cents a pound for binder twine. This thing has been going on under the eyes of the government for several years, and why did they not appoint an inspector before to see that the farmers were not being overcharged? In 1898 it cost \$3.71 for pure manilla according to the Minister of Justice. Adding 75 cents for the cost of manufacturing, that would give \$4.50 per hundred pounds, yet the farmers paid 13 cents in 1898. In 1899 pure manilla cost \$3.39. In 1900 none was produced. We purchased enough in 1899 at \$5.39 to do for another year, yet in 1900 it was sold away up from 12 cents to 15 cents. And this government put the blame on the war for the heavy prices they were charging. In 1901 it cost \$7.54, and in 1902, \$6 per hundred pounds. Adding 75 cents for the manufacturing, that would make \$6.75, and giving a cent per pound profit, you have \$7.15. Yet, it was sold from 12 to 13 cents. In the

Mr. BLAIN.

face of these facts, why do the government not see that the farmers are not obliged to pay two or three times the cost of the production of twine. There was something for an inspector to investigate. The government have appointed Mr. Haycock, market gardener, at a salary of \$100 per month and travelling expenses, which will amount to another \$100 per month, going around the country to see that the manufacturers put a tag on each ball, showing the correct measure. Surely the hon. minister will allow this item to drop and pension off Mr. Haycock, or give him some other work to do.

Mr. COCHRANE. The right hon. the leader of the House pleaded yesterday that he was carrying out a moral obligation. Let me draw his attention to this fact. We are told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that Mr. Haycock has superior qualities and was very eloquent on the stump. We also know the right hon. gentleman once sent a letter to this institution, of which Mr. Haycock was one of the prominent members, endorsing its policy. What policy had the Patrons at that time? Criticising the extravagance of the government. I remember very well the hon. gentleman, when he was on this side, raising his hand to heaven and denouncing the extravagance of the Tory party in spending \$35,000,000 to govern 5,000,000 people. I call upon the right hon. gentleman to carry out now the pledge he made while in opposition to reduce the expenditure of the government \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000. Does he think he will reduce it by employing this man at \$1,200 per year? The right hon. gentleman must feel very sad when he thinks that this government are not carrying out the principles they advocated in opposition.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think that at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. Circumstances alter cases. The hon. gentleman has a very satisfactory berth and is willing to throw to the winds all the promises he ever made. All his anxiety is to retain office. I challenge him and the Minister of Trade and Commerce to point to one principle which they advocated on this side that they have not thrown to the winds. They excuse their extravagance in every instance by the plea: 'Oh, we have inherited this from previous governments.' Well, they did not inherit this particular item. What has become of the \$60,000,000 which they have frittered away? They have not inaugurated one scheme which they ever intended to carry out. They have now before the country a scheme which I do not believe they intend to carry out. The only ambition they have is to keep in office as long as they can.

Mr. HEYD. One of the highest tributes paid to the present government is every allusion to the fact that the patron in-