

But there was another promise we made. We promised our farmers free binder twine, and I remember well, in days gone by, how the charge was thrust in our faces that we were not sincere, that we were simply moving resolutions and making speeches in order to compromise the position of the Government on the trade question, and that if we came into power we would never crystallize these promises into law. Well, fortunately, we came into office. Fortunately for the country we are here, and fortunately for the farmers we carried out the promises which we then gave, and have placed binder twine on the free list. How much did the farmers realize from that? It is estimated that the farmers of Ontario used, in the last harvest, 6,000,000 pounds of binder twine, and by taking off the duty, you will find that we have effected a saving of nearly \$40,000 to the farmers of Ontario alone. And in the North-west Territories there is a large quantity used, though I have not the means of ascertaining what the number of pounds is. But, undoubtedly, very large sums of money will be saved to the farmers of the North-west and Manitoba as well as other parts of the country through this policy. But this did not end the promises of the Liberal party. The Liberal party promised to place corn on the free list. This afternoon an hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) took fifteen minutes to prove that we are all wrong upon the corn question. True, there are differences of opinion upon it even among farmers themselves in different localities as to the wisdom of placing corn upon the free list. But you will understand that when the Government is called upon to frame a policy, they do not frame a policy for one section of the country, but they form a policy which they believe is, on the whole, in the interests of the whole Dominion. I claim that free corn is in the interests of the whole Dominion. Why is free corn advantageous to the farmer? Because the farmers of Ontario particularly, and of other parts of the country also, go largely into the raising of cattle and into dairying, and in order that they may feed their cattle and fit them for the foreign market in which they have to compete with corn-fed cattle, it is admitted by the best authorities in this country that corn is an absolute necessity. It is asserted that free corn will reduce the price of the coarse grain produced on the farm. It cannot do so because the prices are fixed upon the export prices of these articles. We send a large quantity of pease to the old country and the price in the English market regulates the price here. We sell a great quantity of oats in Great Britain, and it is the price obtained there that rules the market in Canada. Therefore, if the farmers find it more profitable to use corn for the feeding of their animals they will sell their pease and oats and their other coarse grains and buy corn. The advantage is very easily proven. I was told to-day

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

that corn could be purchased in Windsor at 18 cents, and oats at from 16 cents to 18 cents per bushel. Supposing a farmer in the neighbourhood of Windsor wished to feed his cattle, would it not pay him to sell 34 pounds of oats from 16 to 18 cents and buy 56 pounds of corn at 18 cents? Will not 56 pounds of corn go further to sustain and fatten an animal than 34 pounds of oats? It is thus plain that it is of advantage to the farmers of the country to have the food which is their raw material as cheap as possible, so that they may make their finished articles as low as possible, and thus realize the highest profit in the British market.

But the Liberal party made other promises. We promised that we would remove specific duties, and we have largely succeeded in doing so. I am sorry that they were not all removed, but, no doubt, that would be difficult to do. We have always contended that the specific duties bore heavier upon the cheaper goods purchased by the poorer classes of people than upon the goods used by the rich. Let me give you an example: Take the case of a shoddy blanket. The old duty was 20 per cent and 10 cents per pound. The blanket I refer to would weigh about 8 pounds and would cost at the factory about \$1. The specific duty at 10 cents per pound on 8 pounds would amount to 80 cents and the ad valorem duty of 20 per cent would amount to 20 cents, or a total of \$1. That is 100 per cent on that blanket. Now take a fine French blanket that weighs 5 pounds and which you buy for \$5. The specific duty amounts to 50 cents and the ad valorem, at 20 per cent, amounts to \$1, a total of \$1.50, or 30 per cent, as compared with 100 per cent on the fisherman's or lumberman's blanket. That is how the principle worked. Take any article on which there is a specific duty, not wines, spirits, beer, and tobacco, with which I have no concern, but take the articles used by the people—and apply this principle and you will find that the specific duties bear very heavily upon the goods used by the poorer class. The Liberals promised to remove this form of duty, and I am glad to say that in the resolutions before us they have been removed to a very large extent, showing that the Liberal party has carried out reasonably well the promises it made, its action thus far being an evidence of what is to be done in the future.

We also promised that luxuries should be taxed higher than they were before. From the public platform we proved to the people that many luxuries were imported into this country which bore a lower duty than many of the necessities of life, and we contended that taxation should fall more heavily upon those parties who were willing and ready and able to buy the luxuries they wanted. And what has been the result? On silk velvets, and all manufactures of silk, embroidery, laces, jewellery, gold and silver-