

Medicine Hat, 13·03 ; Calgary, 13·86 ; Revelstoke, 16·54 ; Lethbridge, 15·39 ; Manitou, 8·51 ; Killarney, 9·06 ; Deloraine, 9·43 ; Carnduff, 9·51 ; Prince Albert, 14·13 ; Edmonton, 16·64 ; Rapid City, 9·06 ; and so on. I need not occupy the time of the House by reading further, but you will see this is a very serious matter. At present, coal oil may be sent in tanks by rail to Winnipeg ; there it is put in barrels and distributed over the west. This also adds to the expense of coal oil in that country. The cost of barrelling the oil, warehousing and re-shipment will be about 5½ cents. Now, I wish to elaborate this a little further and show what the result is when looked at in another light. The rate on coal oil from Petrolea to Lethbridge, for example, per hundred pounds is \$1.66½ ; according to their own rates it is 15·39 cents per gallon, making the freight rate per ton \$33.30. At this rate the freight per carload of twenty tons would be \$666. The distance from Petrolea to Winnipeg is about 1,500 miles, and from Winnipeg to Lethbridge 777 miles. Now, it is generally acknowledged by railway companies the world over that half a cent per ton per mile is good pay. Proceeding upon this principle, half a cent per ton per mile for 2,277 miles would be \$11.38, or per car of twenty tons, \$227.60. The rate charged, you observe, is \$666 instead of \$227.60, or \$438.40 in excess of the generally admitted paying rate. The railroad rate of 15·39 cents per gallon is three times what it should be, three times a paying rate, and should not be more than 5½ cents per gallon on the cargo.

Here, then, you see the freight rate is a very great difficulty. This is not a matter perhaps that the Government can rectify, but they can allow the coal oil transported by railway companies to be examined and permitted to pass on to points in the west, where it can be handled and distributed, thus saving the expense of barrelling the oil which will be 5 cents more, and in this way the difficulty could be to some considerable extent overcome. My contention was when I came to this House this session that we should have at least a 3 cent cut on coal oil. We were met here with this difficulty, that this would seriously affect the business in western Ontario. Well, Sir, I am not so selfish, and I hope the people of the west are not so selfish that they would desire to injuriously affect parties interested in this business. But here is a way out of the difficulty, one which would relieve our people and promote the interests of gentlemen engaged in the business in western Canada, and I hope it will receive the careful consideration of the Government before the House closes, inasmuch as a 5 cent per gallon advantage might be realized by the people.

We would like to see some change made in the new tariff—(1) in regard to agricultural

implements, (2) in regard to coal oil, (3) in regard to fruit.

It is well known that the North-west is not a fruit-growing country. The Territories can produce the best of wheat and of beef, and the people are prepared to purchase their fruit. But a serious difficulty is met with in the new tariff, especially as regards grapes and strawberries. There is a duty of 2 cents per pound upon both these articles, which simply means 200 per cent. In California grapes can be bought for \$20 per ton. The duty on those grapes is \$40 per ton, the duty on packages being extra. Last year it was possible to buy Concord grapes in Michigan at \$7.50 per ton, with the same duty of \$40 per ton, or nearly 500 per cent. We see no reason why the people in the west should be debarred by the tariff from purchasing fruit, and it is desired that lower rates should be granted than those in the new tariff. We are simply throwing out hints and stating reasons why in the interest of the people of the North-west changes should be made, and I hope the hints thrown out will be taken into serious consideration by the Government and that they will give us some relief along those lines.

I believe this Government has at heart the well-being of the agricultural classes. They have given evidence of this in regard to the dairying question and cold storage, and those interests will be largely strengthened by the attention already given them, and our people, having in view what has been done already along those lines, are taking new heart. I am glad also to observe from letters I have received from the North-west that the new tariff is already taking pretty well there. I have pointed out these difficulties, which I personally feel, and I consider it is incumbent on me to speak of them in the interests of the western country. So we accept this tariff as an instalment of what the Government will do. I know it is impossible to remove this principle of protection which is obnoxious to the people of the west—it cannot be done in a year or two. You cannot take the smell out of a fish barrel by one scouring, it needs to be repeated, and so I hope that as regards the tariff, after it has passed under the revision of the Government, the people of the west will find they have supported a Government that is looking forward to the adoption of free trade principles.

I desire to say a word about our relationship to the motherland. As farmers we send many of our surplus products to the mother country, and she receives them gladly ; at the same time we are pleased to have access to her markets, and we feel it a hardship that we cannot be allowed to purchase in an unrestricted market. If she takes our surplus products, it is only just and fair that we should take her manufactured goods, if they are better and cheaper