

and if you dredge to-day you will need to dredge again in a month. That means a continual heavy bill of expense. The hon. gentleman from Middleton, as well as most people in Halifax, are familiar with some experience we had with a number of vessels which went from Halifax during the latter part of last summer, to Fort Nelson with supplies and construction materials, etc., needed there for the purpose of the terminals, and of the railway. Not a single ship, I think, of the half dozen that went there succeeded in landing her cargo. One ship was lost, and the bulk of her cargo lost also. In the case of another vessel, the deck load was thrown overboard, some of it drifting ashore—the remainder went Lord knows where. There was the utmost want of landing facilities and other provision on the part of the employees of the Railway Department. There should have been a number of lighters there, and there was only one lighter for all the vessels, and the result was that some of the vessels came back to Nova Scotia, having on board the cargoes with which they started for Port Nelson. I think the hon. leader of the Government, who is a business man, must see that there is really a substantial reason for pausing before deciding that the terminal shall be located at Port Nelson.

There is another point to which I desire to call attention. There was a good deal of discussion on the subject of the tariff. I have never posed as an expert on tariffs: and a good deal has been said about the high cost of living. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the reduction of the tariff would have no effect in the cost of living, and he gave as substantial ground for that view the fact that while there has been a very considerable reduction in the tariff on food products in the United States, there has been no perceptible reduction in the cost of living. I am reminded of an amusing story, but it is hardly suitable for the Senate.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Go on, let us have it.

Hon. Mr. POWER—As to the rapidity with which results can be obtained. It was only in the month of October last that the change took place in the United States tariff. We must remember, too, that at this time the dealers in the United States had very considerable stocks of food products on hand, and naturally if they could prevent it the prices would not

fall immediately on the change in the tariff. Wait until next summer. I can point to one illustration of a contrary view to that which he has expressed. Some time ago Secretary Daniels, the Secretary of the United States Navy, had occasion to ask for tenders for supplies of beef for the United States navy. Tenders were presented by numbers of dealers in the United States, but Secretary Daniels did not award the contract to any of these tenderers. He gave it to a concern from Argentina, and saved, as has been pointed out, hundreds of thousands of dollars to the navy by so doing. That just shows that the removal of the tariff may have a very considerable effect. The hon. gentleman said that the farmers were anxious for protection, and that it would be an exceedingly unpopular thing with the agricultural class of this country to do anything towards reducing the duties on food products. As I understand it, the United States are in this position. They say to Canada: 'If you will remove the duties on American grain and flour, we shall remove the duties on Canadian grain and flour.' The hon. gentleman seems rather amused at that. This is rather a broad-minded thing on the part of the American Government to say. Is it the farmers who object to this line of action, the removal of duties on United States flour and wheat? Not at all. We have delegations from the West coming and urging the Government, beseeching the Government, to do that very thing. Now why does the Government not do it? The Citizen of Ottawa is a pretty staunch Conservative paper, and I find in yesterday's paper some information that may shed a little light on the attitude of the Government. This refers to the people who want to know about the farmers, and the reducing of the cost of living. The writer says:

They may perhaps be able to find out the reason of the product of the Canadian prairies being sold cheaper in London and Liverpool than in Winnipeg or Montreal. Recent returns show that top grade flour, which costs \$5 per barrel in Winnipeg, \$5.10 in Montreal, \$6.50 in Halifax, N.S., and \$5.50 in St. John's, Newfoundland, sells at \$4.18 in London; that patent which sells in Winnipeg at \$4.80 per barrel and in Montreal at \$4.90 sells in London at \$4.06; baker's, which sells in Winnipeg at \$4 per barrel and in Montreal at \$4.10, sells in London at \$3.60. It will be interesting to learn why flour produced in Canada and transported across a continent and an ocean can be sold much cheaper in London and Liverpool than in Canada. It must be sold at a profit over there,