

not only will the railways be more active in moving cement to the West, but the company will be obliged to establish its industry in the West, as I think all large eastern manufacturers should be obliged to do, because one of the greatest benefits to the West would be the establishment of industries. I am happy to say that I have been able to induce some to locate in the West. I never lose an opportunity of impressing upon our eastern manufacturers the necessity of establishing themselves in those great and growing cities in the West, and I believe they will continue to do so for many years to come.

I have given the matter of freight rates a considerable amount of study, and on cement the freight rate from Fort William is one cent per ton per mile. Cement that was selling in Toronto at \$1.45 a barrel was selling at Edmonton at about \$3 or a little under, and was selling at Saskatoon at \$2.50. My hon. friends seem to have no sympathy for the people or the contractors in the West, in the fact that building construction and paving was interrupted, or that thousands of men would be thrown out of work, but simply criticise this Government for having taken a step in strict accordance with the law.

Now, I think I have dealt with the cement question. I started out to prove to the satisfaction of every member on both sides of the House that the action of the Government was justified, and I should like to invite any member from the West to get up and put himself on record, in view of those facts, as opposing what the Government did last June in regard to cement.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF: I think my hon. friend has been putting the question unfairly to the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Edmonton in saying that they opposed the reduction. What they said was that it was done for political purposes, but they did not oppose the reduction.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): After listening to the telegrams which I have read and the communications received from the Builders' Exchanges, the Boards of Trade, and others in the West, and knowing the situation as he does, can my hon. friend seriously ask me whether any Government could have refrained from taking the action we did? My hon. friend from Assiniboia would have lifted his voice to high Heaven if we had not taken action. If my right hon. friend had been Prime Minister at that time, he would have taken the same action, because he is an intelligent man.

And if I had been in his position I would have done what I think he owed to me and the Government to do, but refrained

from doing,—I would have made some inquiries as to the information upon which the Government took the action which is now complained of by my hon. friend.

By the way, in connection with that, I said before my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came in that, while this Government had been accused of being in league with the trusts, mergers and combines, it seems that we are not likely to be any longer open to that reproach, for I have said that we are the first Government that has ever taken a merger of this kind in hand and made it have more regard to the duty it owed to the consuming public.

In connection with this I have an extraordinary report of a speech by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Let me say with regard to this and other newspaper clippings, that I have been so frequently misreported that I am going to ask my hon. friend, either now or with the permission of the House or later, to state whether this fairly represents a speech he made at Marieville on the 7th September last. Note the date, and remember that Parliament prorogued last April. He was talking very properly about the Government, but not so properly against the Government and its policy. According to this report he said:

They have formed a tariff commission which is composed of men high up in the Trusts.

The Senate, as hon. members know, threw out the Tariff Commission Bill. And I think hon. members might well consider the names of those who voted against that Bill. I think that would be a conclusive answer to the hon. gentleman's charges last winter that the Tariff Commission was formed in the interests of the trusts, mergers and combines.

They have formed a Tariff Commission which is composed of men high up in the trusts. The present Government was formed by the trusts and it could not very well refuse to give to those trusts all the protection possible.

You know how much they have got since we came in.

The Commission was formed but received instruction to ignore the rightful demands of the farmers.

This is real news.

Why have the workingmen and the small proprietor on the farm no representative on the Commission?

The conclusive answer to that is that the Commission was not formed.

Have they not the same rights as the trusts? Do not they deserve some consideration at the hands of the Government?