

they do not even reduce the duty on agricultural implements, although both are used by the farmer? I hold that binder twine has a claim to a small protection, say 10 per cent or 12½ per cent. Now, there is a great deal of talk about giving the preference to Great Britain and to the British colonies, we hear a great deal of talk about loyalty and patriotism and binding all the Empire together in this way. But what are we doing by making binder twine free? Why, we are giving to the United States more than a preference, we are giving them this whole country as a market for their goods without paying a cent of duty. We find that the binder twine for this country is being manufactured in the United States, the people who make this binder twine do not contribute one cent to the revenue of this country, while the men who were making it here are now walking about the streets. I consider that is a condition of things which is a disgrace to this country. I really think the Government should impose a duty of, say 10 per cent on binder twine, in order that our workmen may have some advantage in that way, and be protected against the binder twine that is sent in here free from across the line. It may be said that this is done in the interests of the farmers. Well, I hold that the farmers will not buy their binder twine one cent less on account of the duty being removed, there will be no reduction at all in the price to them. If a duty of 10 per cent was imposed on binder twine the price could not be put up. Binder twine is manufactured in the Central Prison, in the penitentiary at Kingston, and in Brantford by a farmers' company there. There are plenty of manufacturers in this country that would keep down the price by competition. I think that argument has no weight at all. I do not think the Government have any ground at all to stand on in refusing to put a duty on binder twine. I would here make a strong appeal to them, as strong as I can, that they should reconsider this matter, now that the matter has been brought to their attention. I know they have decided not to do it for the present, but I hope they will reconsider their decision, and make another one in the interests of the workmen of this country. I am not advocating this in the interests of the Consumers' Cordage Company or of any other cordage company. I have no particular interest in them, but I have an interest in the workmen of this country who have been making this binder twine up to the present, and who, if the duty is not reimposed, will probably suffer considerable injury.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot agree with the compliment that the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) has paid to the Government. He compliments them for breaking faith with the people of this country. I am a protectionist, have been, and intend

to be as long as we have a country to protect. I believe in protecting every article that we can grow or produce in this country. But those hon. gentlemen opposite came into power promising the people that if they got in they would reduce the duty on coal oil, or give the farmers of this country free coal oil; that they would reduce the duty on almost every article that the farmer consumes. We have their tariff brought down last night by the Minister of Finance with a flourish of trumpets, saying to the people of this country that after the 1st of July we will give a general reduction of 25 per cent on all articles imported into this country. Articles imported from where? From England only. Now, I have carefully read over that list. What can I find in that list that is going to receive the benefit of the preferential duty and that is going at the same time to benefit the farmers of this country? The first article on the list is animals, living. The old duty was 20 per cent, the new duty is 20 per cent, but under the preference, after the 1st of July, it will be 15 per cent. What benefit is that going to be to the farmers of this country? The only animals imported into this country are thoroughbreds for the improvement of stock. These come in free to-day, therefore the preference clause in the tariff on animals is not going to benefit the farmers any. The next item is books. If applied to school books for the different provinces, there might be some benefit in it. But the farmers of this country are not very much interested in a duty on books published in England. So you might go through the list. Another item of great interest to the farmers, is the article of corn, and there we find about the only reduction in the tariff of any importance. Corn they have made free, to the great injury of the farmers, particularly of Ontario, and it will prove to be an injury to those of the North-west and to all others throughout the Dominion. Because all the provinces produced coarse grains, which should be used in feeding and fattening our own cattle. Therefore, as a protectionist, and a strong protectionist, I support the motion of my hon. friend in condemnation of this Government; and I think many hon. gentleman opposite should join us in condemning the leaders of their party for having gone to the country and promised they would do certain things if placed in power. They have been placed in power, on the faith of those pledges. Have they kept their pledges?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say, no. The hon. gentleman comes from a part of a country near where coal oil is produced. He in fact carried his election on coal oil; but the Government have not reduced the duty on it, and have not carried out their promises. The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig)