

be, and I should judge from the haste of the hon. member (Mr. Lalor) in rising that he has something to do with the canners' combine, and just as long as we have men in this House of Commons who have made hundred of thousands of dollars out of such a combine there is very little chance for the consumers of the Dominion. I have not studied the cement question sufficiently to say how the tariff affects that commodity, but I know what the railway rates on cement are to western Canada, and I know that you have to pay \$3.25 in Regina for the same barrel of cement that costs you \$1.20 in Owen Sound. Is it any wonder the people of the west feel that they have been bled more or less by the railway corporations and by the manufacturers of eastern Canada? I say, Sir, that the necessaries of life should be placed on the free list, in the best interests of the consuming masses of the country. Why should we have to pay a tax of 25 per cent or 30 per cent on the woollens we use? Why should men be permitted to make millions of dollars on the tinware and kitchen utensils we use to cook our food, on account of the tariff which protects the manufacturers of these articles? That is how we look at these things in western Canada, and I tell the men of the east that if they are not prepared to meet us by reducing the tariff on certain items, they need not be surprised if a feeling does arise between eastern and western Canada, and if such a feeling does arise it is the manufacturers of eastern Canada who will be to blame. Yes, the manufacturers are loyal just so far as their pocketbooks are concerned. What is Canadian nationality to them but their pocketbooks? There are men in this House of Commons to-day who are proclaiming against the farmers of western Canada and who have actually made millions of dollars out of the consuming masses of this country. I do not know whether or not there is a manufacturer of agricultural implements in this House, and I don't care.

An hon. MEMBER. There are some on your side.

Another hon. MEMBER. In the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Perhaps before I conclude some member on that side will bob up and say he is a manufacturer of agricultural implements. Perhaps the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, who brought the matter up in the House last session, can tell us why it is that in the southern parts of Saskatchewan and Manitoba the farmers pay more for their agricultural implements than the farmers of the adjoining northern states pay for the same implements. I have here figures

obtained from implement men, and no doubt they are correct, and they show that in southern Saskatchewan the farmer has to pay \$90 for a wagon which in Montana or Minnesota he can buy for \$80; that the farmer in southern Saskatchewan pays for five-foot mowers \$57, which are bought by the farmer in the northern states for \$47.50 each. These figures also show that binders cost the southern Saskatchewan farmer from \$150 to \$160 each. I am told that last year they sold in Regina for \$180, and the same mower can be bought for \$140 in the northern states. Then the Saskatchewan farmer has to pay \$85 for a gang plough which can be bought for \$70 across the line, and \$57 for a hay fork which his neighbour in the northern states can purchase at from \$28 to \$35. How is that explained? Is it fair that the southern Saskatchewan farmer should pay from 10 to 20 per cent more for what he needs than does his brother farmer to the south of the line, just for the benefit of affording protection to the Canadian manufacturers? You can only ascribe the difference in cost to the tariff or to the freight rates, and you can divide the burden on the Canadian farmer between the two just as you please. Now, I have always stood for a moderate tariff, excepting perhaps on the necessaries of life. I have always told the people of my province that I believed it to be in the best interests of the whole Dominion that we should have a moderate protective tariff. But, when the reciprocity agreement, making for reduced taxation and larger markets, was put before the electors, and the eastern manufacturers—by what means it matters not—succeeded in defeating it, headed by the loyal city of Toronto, is it any wonder that there should be a divergence of opinion and a sort of separation existing between eastern and western Canada?

I want to say a word in conclusion about the amendment moved by the right hon. the leader of the opposition. Every one who was in this House last session knows full well that the head of the Nationalist party was the Minister of Public Works, and every one knows that he and the present Prime Minister were then at daggers drawn on the navy question. I saw printed in the newspapers statements that were alleged to have been made by the Nationalists of the province of Quebec and if such statements were made by any man who occupies a seat in this House he does not deserve to be here. Whether they were made or not as alleged, the people in my part of the county have an idea that they were made, and if such statements were made by the Nationalist leaders in Quebec then all I can say is that these men are traitors to their country and their flag. In view of the great