

Q. What you are proving is that the people of Manitoba pay more for their own flour at home than the American pays for corresponding flour across the line, notwithstanding the fact that Manitoba flour is sold for less money across the ocean than American flour?—A. Exactly. Manitoba flour that sold on the 22nd of November, in Mark Lane for \$2.60 was sold in Winnipeg for \$3.10, that is for 98 lbs. I am told they have to pay \$3.50 for it in Calgary. We were paying \$3.10 for the best patent in Winnipeg and it has been sold in Ottawa for \$2.75. Our labouring man in Winnipeg buys a 7 lb. sack of flour and pays 35 cents for it, and the labouring man in Manchester, England, can buy the same flour for 22 cents. The point I want to make is this: the Lake of the Woods Milling Co., the Ogilvy Milling Co., the Western Milling Co. and the Maple Leaf are in combination. They secure the raw material at from 10 to 15 cents a bushel less than the Minneapolis miller, and they sell their flour at a less price in the Old Country by about 6 cents a hundred than the Minneapolis miller. They sell their flour in the Old Country cheaper than they sell it to us simply because they are protected. We have an illustration here of how a protected country have to pay more for what they produce than a free trade country has to, for the same product.

By Hon. Mr. Bell:

Q. How about United States?—A. The same thing, but not as bad as ours apparently, because they have not as big trust as we have in Canada in the flour business. In dealing with this trade arrangement, the consuming class have the benefit in a free trade country because they can get flour and meat and all feed products cheaper than we can. We paid \$491,134.98 duty on meats last year. I do not think there is any question but that the man that ate the meat paid for it. We paid \$45,519.81 duty on butter. No farmer can say that he got any benefit, but the labouring man had to pay more. We paid \$244,430.65 duty on fish. If the reciprocity agreement had gone into force nobody would have had to pay that duty. The prime reason why protection is no good to the farmer is that we grow more than we can consume in the country. Another thing is that the producer does not get in touch with the consumer. We sell our wheat in Manitoba for 1½ cents a pound and we buy it back when manufactured into flour for 3 cents. There is a spread that neither the consumer or producer gets any benefit of. If there was free trade in flour that spread would not be so great. We sell our hogs at \$5.50 per cwt. and buy back the bacon at 20 to 25 cents a pound. Is it not reasonable to suppose that should the farmer get 1 or 2 cents per lb. more for his hogs and the man who consumes the bacon get it for 5 cents less, the middleman should still get a sufficient profit. Our system protects the middleman and not the producer or consumer. A farmer's wife in Manitoba will take butter to the store one hundred and fifty miles away from Winnipeg and trade it off at 15 cents a pound for goods from the store. The consumer in Winnipeg pays 25 cents a pound for that same butter. The same applies to poultry and other farm produce. A neighbour of mine went to buy a traction gas engine in the fall of 1909. He discovered that he could buy a machine manufactured by Gould Shapley and Muir in Brantford for \$2,400 delivered on his farm. He went to Minneapolis and discovered that he could get the same class of machine at \$1,900, that is the retail price, the manufacturers price was \$1,600. He bought the American machine and paid \$400 duty and freight. He had it delivered on his farm at less than he could deliver the Canadian machine on his farm. It worked out in this way, he paid \$400 in duty to the government; had he bought the Canadian machine that duty would have gone into the pocket of the manufacturer, and the government, or the farmer, would not have received any benefit. Now when you come to figure out how much wheat he had to pay in exchange for that machine as compared to the amount of wheat the Minnesota farmer would have to pay, we find that in that time wheat was worth 90 cents a bushel in Winnipeg and in Minneapolis \$1.05, and the Minnesota farmer could