

ference and made that insinuation. Does not that hon. gentleman know that the difference is not \$2.24 at all? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) gave the figures here, and he is in a position to know them, being interested in the sugar business himself and having an accurate knowledge of it; and he showed that sugar, instead of costing the refiner \$4.40, cost him \$5.14 per 100 lbs. He insinuated that \$2.24 per 100 lbs. go not into the Dominion treasury, but into the pockets of the refiners. What are the facts? Does the hon. gentleman not know that the prices quoted are the prices at the place where the sugar is grown? Does he not know that a hundred ships are employed carrying a thousand tons each, or carrying one hundred thousand tons of sugar into Canada? Does he not know still further that there are 800 men employed in the manufacturing of this sugar, and there are 800,000 barrels required to hold it, costing 32 cents per barrel, making a value of \$256,000. Does he not know that 50,000 tons of coal are used in the refining of that sugar, making an additional value of \$200,000 to this country, representing the wages of the men employed in the mines less the profits of those who employ them? These enormous sums are to be deducted out of the imaginary \$2.24 which the hon. gentleman mentioned. More than that, does the hon. gentleman not know that the prices he quoted are the prices at which sugar is sold by the wholesale dealers, and we have sworn evidence to prove that the profits of the wholesale dealers are from 40 to 50 cents per 100 lbs. I believe the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) is one of the men who pocketed these profits, and when, in making that quotation, he did not state that 40 or 50 cents out of the \$2.24 went partly into his own pockets and partly into the pockets of those who were with him in the combine, I do not think he was treating this House fairly. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) says he is opposed to the National Policy because it promised a market to the farmer and presumably did not give the farmer that promised market, and he returned to the question of wheat. He said that wheat was dearer between the years 1873-74 than it has been since. Well, if it was dearer then, that was due to the fact that the markets of the whole world were higher; but I say we have in this question of wheat this advantage: Last year there were about 207,000 barrels of flour exported from this country to Great Britain, and there were imported from the United States almost exactly the same quantity, or 205,000 barrels. The imports of and exports of wheat flour being about the same, it follows that the whole production of the wheat of Canada was consumed in Canada. How much is that? It is estimated that it requires 27,000,000 bushels of wheat to feed the people of Canada, and we have this gratifying fact, that out of that 27,000,000 bushels at least 26,000,000 were supplied by the Canadian farmers, so that we have almost the full control of the Canadian market. It is the more gratifying to find that although last year there were about 167,000 barrels of flour imported into the country, that from the nine months up to the first of April of the financial year the return show 45,000 barrels imported into this country. That would be for the whole year 60,000 barrels, while for the previous year there were 200,000 barrels imported, including wheat, showing

Mr. WALLACE.

that this 15 cents of duty on wheat has given almost entire control of the Canadian market to the Canadian farmer and miller. But these gentlemen will tell you that has raised the price of flour to the consumer, and I will quote what the hon. leader of the Opposition has to say on that point. These gentlemen are always very solicitous about the interests of the farmers. They claim that the manufacturers are robbers, and that the farmers are their own special care. Here is what the leader of the Opposition said last July at Ste. Anne, in the County of Montmorency, Quebec:

"This tax, however, was not imposed of public necessity, as it is alleged that there is a surplus of \$7,000,000, but rather in the interest of the Ontario and Manitoba farmers, who raise wheat in great quantities. In other words, it takes the money out of the pockets of those who buy the flour, and puts it into the pockets of those who produce it. These are the tactics of our Tory Government."

Now, these gentlemen, when speaking to the farmers of Ontario, ridicule the idea that the protection on wheat is of any benefit to the Canadian farmer. But when they come to the Province of Quebec where the farmers are not straight wheat-growers, but are consumers of flour, we have the leader of the Opposition saying that this tax is put on for the benefit of the Ontario and Manitoba farmers. In reply to the assertion that the duty increases the price to the consumer in the Province of Quebec and the lower provinces, I would say that there are 1,200 to 1,400 flour mills in Ontario alone, that these millers have no combination of any kind whatever, for it would not be possible for them to have a combine. They are competing with each other in buying wheat as cheaply and selling flour as dearly as they can. There is no combination among them but the strongest competition, and, therefore, the consumer in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces gets the article at the lowest price. Then they ask, what benefit is the duty to the Manitoba and Ontario farmers? It gives to the Canadian farmer the control of the Canadian market, almost exclusively. The returns show this year that there will be about 60,000 barrels of flour, or less than 300,000 bushels of wheat, imported into this country, while the consumption being 27,000,000 bushels, we control almost the entire supply of the products of wheat to the people. What we have always contended for, and what we can demonstrate from history, is that the home market is the best, not only in the case of flour and wheat, but for every other product of the farm; and by keeping this home market for the benefit of Canadian farmers, we are helping to enrich an important industry of the country. I will read what evidence was given by Mr. W. G. Blaney, a miller in the city of Boston, before the Committee:

"The general tenor of the evidence may be gathered from W. G. Blaney's testimony." He said: "Until the Canadian Government placed a duty upon flour and grain we had a very large and profitable trade with the provinces. At that time there were a number of merchants in Boston engaged in business with the provinces. At the present time there are but one or two. We shipped largely flour, provisions and other merchandise, and in return received their products. There are one or two firms who do a large business now with the provinces, but it is in Canadian flour. They handle somewhere in the neighbourhood of 200,000 barrels of Canadian flour, which is brought here in bond and afterwards forwarded to the provinces. Altogether there are some 500,000 barrels of flour shipped through Boston to the Maritime Provinces, from Canada. Should we have free trade with Canada, the larger part of that flour would be American flour."