

If the benefits are here now, they were there in 1911; if reciprocity is good now, it was good in 1911, and we should have had it ten years ago. The Government is entitled to no credit for having adopted some of the provisions of the reciprocity agreement which they thought would be beneficial to the people of this country. I maintain that the Government was lax in not putting into operation this reciprocity agreement which was initiated by those who had made a study of economic questions. It was the people, not the Government, who took the initiative in these matters and presented them to the Government. I am persuaded that in the majority of cases good legislation is initiated by the people themselves, and for that reason governments should keep their ear to the ground. If they will do that, they will learn what the people want long before the initiative strikes the average individual who is elected to Parliament, because the people are thinking; it is the people whose pockets are touched.

I have often thought since I have been a member of this House, and I am speaking as a very practical man, because I have done these things myself, that if I could take the members of this Government out to the West, get them working on a big 40-inch cylinder threshing machine, and say to them early in the morning: "Boys, we will put through 2,000 bushels of wheat to-day," as I have done many a time, I am sure that after working side by side all day long and receiving for their day's labour \$2—I have worked for \$30 a month—they would have learned something about economics. They would know something about how the people are taxed, what a burden taxation is upon them; they would know that when the people cried for reciprocity, they knew what they were talking about, and what they wanted. They were in earnest when they asked for it. If I could only get the members of the Government to do that, they would learn a lesson in economics they would never forget. That is one of the places to learn it. I stand here to-day because I believe I have learned that lesson. I have come here to try and make you believe what I have experienced is the truth, and to look at things from the other fellow's point of view. I want you to know that it is an uphill fight for the producer when he has to support such a heavy burden of taxation. He asks for redress because he has a real grievance, and it is the Government's duty to listen to it, and to give the

[Mr. Gould.]

producers at least some of the things they are asking for.

There is only one thing more I wish to refer to, and that is the statement made by the hon. member for South Cape Breton and Richmond (Mr. Butts) regarding the 50,000 tons of coal sent to Montreal. The Americans undersold the Canadians by 31 cents a ton, even though they had to pay a duty of 50 cents a ton. Notwithstanding that duty, I believe the Americans made money. I believe that is the underlying principle governing this whole thing. I believe an individual can ship his goods in here, pay the freight, and still sell at a profit. He is not going to undersell his competitor at a loss. That is the fundamental principle. I do not believe that the miner receives any more in wages than he should, but there is some one between the man who mines the coal and the man who burns it, and it is that middle man who should be investigated. I believe that that 31 cents and that 50 cents should be traced down to find where the bugbear exists between the producer and the consumer.

The hon. gentleman talked about paying \$16 per barrel for flour, and he looked across at us when he referred to that. We are not manufacturing flour; we are simply raising the wheat. If he has had to pay \$16 a barrel, and I do not doubt his word, it is not because we received the \$16, but because an individual came in between the raiser of the wheat and the consumer. He it was who is responsible for that greatly enhanced price, and I maintain that in the interests of the consumer it is the duty of the Government to look into this spread of prices caused by the middle man. All these things enter into trade agreements, and if you have trade barriers, as you will have if you refuse this reciprocal arrangement, it simply means that these individuals are fenced around in their privileges, as has been shown many times on the floor of this House, and are able to enhance the price between the producer and the consumer.

I shall not detain the House any longer on this question. I believe it is in the interests of the people, and particularly of my people, who will expect me to go on record as favouring reciprocity, as I have done in the past, that there should be embodied in the legislation of this country, as I hope there will be, and always have hoped, provisions similar to those of the reciprocity agreement. Starting with that, we can go on by degrees to free trade, if you wish to call it that, or to a process of