The Chairman: When these questions commenced we were on galley 4, at "general operating results of the Canadian company." Shall we proceed from there?

By Mr. Needham:

Q. Were these Canadian made goods that were exported from Canada?

—A. You mean implements and machines?

Q. Yes?—A. They were Canadian made.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. And you say that they were sold for export?—A. They are the export subsidiary of the Harvester Company. I have no information as to their ultimate destination.

Q. They were not sold to the United States, to the other company?—A. No, I already stated that the export volume was relatively small, and it would

go through the export company.

Q. That would be a very important item of interest. It might be interesting to know just what percentage of that \$21,000,000 was exported to other countries?—A. They all went to countries other than the United States, substantially speaking.

Q. Other than the United States?—A. Yes, and I am informed that Empire countries took a good portion of that. In some cases the Canadian product because of its suitability was shipped to the Argentine. In this case they

shipped these Canadian made goods to the Argentine.

Q. It would alse be very interesting to ascertain, if possible, the retail and wholesale value of these machines when sold in countries like Argentina?—A. That is a very comprehensive study and I feel that frankly, if you ask my opinion, I think it is a thing that this committee might spend six months on. The United States government did some work along that line and I saw some of the results of it and I talked to the man in Washington who was in charge of it. I did not think his results were conclusive and he had spent a very long period in the study of it. But generally speaking I think you will find in the statement I propose to bring before you in regard to the Massey-Harris Company you can see the comparable amounts paid by the Canadian farmer and the foreign farmer for the product of the Massey-Harris Company. That would probably give you the information you seek, possibly better than in this case where it is not so obvious.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Is it possible to get a comparable figure on a typical farm implement for export by the International Harvester Company at the point of export and the price charged at the distributing point in Canada?—A. Would you mind repeating that, Mr. Coldwell?

Q. Yes. What I want to get at is this; the price charged for the implement, say a combine, by the company to the farmer, and the price charged for export

laid down at a point such as Montreal for shipment?—A. Exactly.

Q. And the price of a similar implement charged to the distributing point at we will say Winnipeg. I am not interested in what the Argentine farmer pays because his price includes such things as freight, storage etc. The comparison I think is between the prise which the Canadian farmer has to pay and the price at which the article is laid down for export.

Mr. McLean: We had evidence on that last year.

WITNESS: Yes, last year Mr. Jarchow gave us evidence on that point; and last Saturday in Chicago he undertook to give me definite information as to the price at New York—really the price at the factory because it amounts to the same thing when you deduct the freight—the price at the factory on