

the plaintiff delayed on account of waiting for the adjudication of his rights in any other case.

### THE DUTY ON BINDING TWINE.

Mr. MULOCK moved :

That the House do go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution: That binding twine be placed upon the free list.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the motion which I am about to place in your hands I gave notice of on the 1st of May, but at the request of the Government I have allowed it to stand until the present time. In view of the long time that has elapsed in unsuccessful endeavour in this way to ascertain the intentions of the Government, and also in view of the fact that in the Budget speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance a few days ago no reference is made to this important subject, I deem it my duty now to bring the matter to the attention of the House. In proposing that binding twine be placed on the free list, in order to establish a case it will only be necessary, I think, to show a reasonable prospect that a reduction in price to the consumer would result from the adoption of the course this motion suggests. I would, therefore, trouble the House with a few figures, which I think are reliable, showing the prices which obtain to-day in Canada and in the adjoining country. I am informed by what I consider a reliable authority that the prevailing price of binding twine in the United States to-day, in car loads of ten tons, is as follows : pure manila, 11 cents ; pure sisal, 7½ cents ; pure New Zealand, 7 cents ; whereas the prices in Canada in similar quantities are as follows : pure manila, 14 cents, and pure sisal from 11 cents to 12½ cents. Thus you will see that there is a difference between the prices in the States and in Canada of upwards of 3 cents per pound.

Mr. McMILLAN. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give us the source of his information for these quotations ?

Mr. MULOCK. The figures I have read are from a letter which I received from a dealer. I will read the letter without giving the signature, unless it is really important.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MULOCK. I am willing to give the name if desired. The letter, upon which I partly base my information, is written to a firm of manufacturers of implements, and is an application to them to do business through the writer. It is as follows :—

“DEAR SIRS,—The National Cordage Co. of New York quote me prices as follows:—Ten-ton lots pure manila, 11 cents; pure sisal, 7½ cents; New Zealand, 7 cents. At these prices you should do some business. Do not say much about it, as I do not want the Canadian cord men to get after me. I expect to place over twenty cars here, as I can undersell them nearly a cent and make \$250 a car on it. The duty is 25 per cent. I got samples of this twine and find it is superior to any of the Canadian makes. They also make mixed twine of different prices.”

I have had the advantage of information from persons in the trade and others, and I think that the figures I give represent substantially the difference in prices prevailing in the United States and Canada to-day.

Mr. McDUGALL (Cape Breton). Would the figures you give apply to car loads in Canada as well ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes ; the figures I give apply to car loads of ten tons each in the United States and Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to whether that is the American charge at which they propose to send to Canada, or is it the export price for Canadian consumption ?

Mr. MULOCK. The prices I have read are the prices at which the company in question are prepared to sell to the Canadian dealer for the Canadian market.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Do they sell their own dealers at that price ?

Mr. MULOCK. I believe the Americans have a system that obtains in Canada as well. I understand the Canadian manufacturers of binder twine, taking advantage of the tariff, exact a higher price from the Canadian consumers than they do from those abroad.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That is a Yankee trick.

Mr. MULOCK. It is being copied here. Our National Policy is only a Yankee imitation. At all events, on reading that valuable work on combines, which was the outcome of the enquiry directed by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), a couple of years ago, you will find it there sworn to that the Canadian manufacturer of binder twine sells the article at a lower price, of about a cent, I think, a pound to those outside of Canada than to the Canadian consumer. The result is that the Canadian consumer is obliged to pay, to-day, on an average, about 3 cents per pound more for the twine than he otherwise would have. I presume that if an American manufacturer wishes to trade abroad and chooses to sell to-day to Canada at less than he would sell in the United States he would adopt that same policy, whether there be a tariff wall or not.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is familiar with the policy of the American manufacturers. I am not, any further than what they have made public. But following out my reasoning, I find that the result is that the farmers of Canada are compelled to pay, on an average, 3 cents a pound more than the article is worth ; for it is reasonable to presume that the American manufacturer does not sell the stuff either to the people of Canada or the United States at less than its value. It is not our business if he is selling to the United States consumers at a higher price than he can get from the Canadian consumer plus the duty. It is sufficient for us to look after the interests of Canadian farmers, and I think on that point there can be no doubt the tariff to-day has placed the Canadian farmer, in respect of binder twine, entirely at the mercy of that industry, which is using the tariff to exact unreasonable advantage and profit from the Canadian people. Just to bring this matter home to myself, I made a calculation as to what the excessive price costs the people of the County of York ; and taking the last returns, the returns for last year, from the county council of the County of York, I find it is there stated that there are now in the County of York 529,044 acres of land assessed, and assuming that one-third of that is under grain crop there would be 176,348 acres of crop to take off. Thus, if it