

other machines, taking out of the pockets of the farmers \$38.30 profit on a binder, \$13.80 profit on a mower, and so on all down the list. While these people condemned the Conservative party, or any party that left a duty on farm implements or machinery, the United Grain Growers Grain Company of the west were exacting a profit of over 21 per cent on these very same machines, and were taking absolutely no risk whatever in regard to bad debts—because it was a cash transaction all through the deal so far as they were concerned. They stood in the same position in the buying of machines as anybody else. If they bought a mower from the United States it came over at a certain price. They claimed that the duty obliged them to add a certain amount to that price. Very well; accept that if you like; that does not justify their adding a still further 21 per cent profit for themselves. While they professed to be particularly anxious about the farmer, they were showing that in their dealings with the farmers—cash dealings in which they ran no risk of bad accounts—they were taking exorbitant profits all along the line, not only in regard to machinery but in regard to everything else.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Does the hon. member happen to know that the Grain Growers Grain Company, even if they were taking 21 per cent more on account of duties, or whatever they took it for, sold those implements at a great deal less than the regular line companies of Canada?

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac-Addington): No, I do not know anything of the kind. I know that was the sworn evidence of Rice-Jones, the manager of the company, given in this building a few years ago. He stated under oath that the company of which he was manager was taking a profit on those implements of over 21 per cent. There is the plain language; there is the source of my information, and my hon. friend can find his evidence in the report in the Library, as I found it. That is my statement, and I again point out that you must take into consideration the fact that they had their men under salary at the various elevators; they were paying them anyway, and all they had to do was to write one or two letters; it was a cash transaction in every case and there was no risk of bad debts. Surely people who profess to be deeply concerned about the farmers should be content to give them the benefit of the service and let them have the machines without taking a profit of over 21 per cent on the transaction. When they were taking

[Mr. J. W. Edwards.]

a profit of over 21 per cent in their own dealings with the farmers, I say it ill became them to come to this House and find fault with any government or party which was imposing a tariff of a little more than half of the profits they were taking.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), referring to the reciprocity election of 1911, said that the man who wrote "Rule Britannia" was the one who won that election for the Conservative party. I do not think he is right in that at all. The people of Canada voted as they did in 1911, not because of "Rule Britannia;" not because they were patriotic citizens of the country, but they voted in their own interests. So far as singing Rule Britannia is concerned, I hope the party on this side of the House will always take the lead in singing that grand old hymn, and I say to the Minister of Finance that he will never find this party trying to substitute any other flag for the Union Jack, either.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac-Addington): Some hon. gentlemen across the floor laugh, but I am particularly serious when I say that, and I am justified in making that allusion because of what was done here about a year ago by the hon. gentleman who is leading the Liberal party in this country.

Mr. STEWART (West Edmonton): It worked well in the election.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac-Addington): It was not that which worked in the election at all; it was the fact that under the reciprocity pact this was what was proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite: They proposed to oblige the farmer to pay additional money because of tariffs on everything that he had to buy and to expose him to the competition of the world in everything that he had to sell. That is the situation. Will any hon. gentleman contradict me in that? The United States in that pact opened its doors to the natural products of one country alone—Canada. That was where their competition was coming from, and many people even to-day believe that if Canada had adopted that agreement she would be opening her doors to the natural products of only the United States. That is not the case at all. Under that agreement when we opened our doors to the natural products of the United States, we also opened them to the natural products of some fifteen other countries under the favoured nations clause. I need mention only one—the Argentine republic. At that time, perhaps, competition