

case that has not been touched at all. I find that cash wheat was quoted at 97½ cents in St. Louis yesterday. The flour made from that wheat would cost \$5.29 per barrel delivered here. That is the price it would cost to lay it down here, duty paid. I find it would cost us 10 cents for freight, which is certainly very low, and this, with the duty added, would make us pay for the wheat \$1.22½ cents laid down here. \$5.53 would be what it would cost us to make the barrel of flour out of the same wheat the American makes his flour out of, making the cost to us 24 cents dearer than to the American. (Hear, hear). Now, they have already paid the duty of 50 cents per barrel. If they paid 24 cents more, or 74 cents net duty, we would at present prices of wheat, be on exactly an even footing with them. What does this show? Simply, that if we get the Government to increase the duty to \$1 per barrel, we will have 26 cents protection on our \$5, or about 5 per cent., and I think our milling industry ought to be protected more than that. The woollen manufacturers are protected to the extent of over 1-5, and here we are only asking for less than 5 per cent., and can't get that. (hear, hear) It is a mighty queer thing, if with our fifteen millions of good, hard, cold cash invested in Canada, we have not sufficient influence and power to get a protection of 1-5, of what other manufacturing industries are getting. All I have to say is this, that if such is the state of affairs, God help the millers of Canada! I find by turning over my books that six years ago, in March, 1882, we were paying \$1.32 per bushel for our wheat, and had a margin of 34 cents on our flour. To-day any of you will be able to say what margin you have, and will agree with me that we don't get a quarter of that amount. Sir Leonard Tilley said in reply to a deputation of which I was one of the spokesmen, "It may be a question, whether or not this question should not be taken immediately into our earnest consideration." Last year, 900,000 barrels of flour were imported into Canada and here we are to-day, paying something like \$450,000 per annum to the Government, for the privilege of having Canadians use American flour in Ontario. What are we to do about it? Gentlemen, if any one of us builds a \$10,000 mill, we have to pay a duty of \$2,500 to do so. There is just that much protection on the mill furnishings, materials and machinery. True enough, the materials are manufactured in Canada, but the manufacturers are protected to the extent of 25 per cent., and we pay that duty. (Hear, hear). I had the pleasure last summer of attending a millers' convention in Buffalo, N. Y., and heard an address by President Sebyt; and he said this: "If a mill is built, it is built to stay there. You may give such opposition to the miller as will kill him and crush him out of business, but the mill is there all the same, and every time one man is crushed or crowded out, some other man will come along and take hold of that mill and work it, and make flour. You may kill the miller every time, but the mill remains there just the same." (Hear, hear). Now, just another thing. Instead of one lot of millers meeting here and another lot meeting there, and one lot wanting and asking for one thing, and another lot wanting and asking for another, the American millers, with whom we come into competition, are organized every time. Why, it was surprising, at that meeting in Buffalo, N. Y., there were millers present from all over the United States. Some had come all the way from California to discuss millers' interests. The result is, they are a power and an influence in the States, and their power and influence is felt and respected. I don't know any reason why we can't have a similar organization right here in Canada. Then, if we can't get what we want, and what is rightly and justly due us from the Government, we will take other means adapted to that purpose. As has been said, it's votes Governments are after; and if we can't get what we want by asking for it, then we have just got to go to work and show what we can do, and will do, and then we'll get what we want. (Applause).

Mr. Gibbs said: "Although I am not a miller, yet I handle flour, but it isn't a matter of any particular moment to me whether I handle Minneapolis strong bakers or Canadian flour. It is just a question whether it would not be better to consider the matter more carefully before proceeding further. There is no use asking more from any Government than you are entitled to. The difference between the duty on flour and the protection afforded to other manufacturing industries, is not just exactly as Mr. Brown has stated. If you get a duty of 25 cents per barrel more than protection against the American flour, it is a direct tax upon the people, and you can't get over it. Now, on woollen goods there is a difference, for the money is paid out to the country again in wages, and that's the principle of the National Policy. 4 per cent. duty on flour is a great deal higher tax on the people than 40 per cent. duty on woollens or on any

other article where a large number of hands are employed in the manufacture. But, on the other hand, if you ask for an *ad valorem* duty of the same extent as the Americans have against us, then if the Government doesn't grant this, the sympathies of the people will be with us, for they will see we are asking for only what we are entitled to and should have, and what won't be a direct tax on the people. There is no use urging the Government to put up the duty to make a direct tax on the consumer, for they won't do it, and there's no use asking them. Quebec and the Lower Provinces will be arrayed against them, and it will be no use asking \$1 per barrel. Better ask 75 cents and get it, than \$1 and be refused.

Mr. J. L. Spink said: "I don't think there's anything in what Mr. Gibbs has said at all. No miller in Canada is going to charge the 99 cents every time because he has \$1 protection against flour coming in from the United States. There may be an idea that we would keep up the price of flour, and so I guess would men in any other branch of trade, but I can tell you that so long as Canadian mills can in 45 days manufacture all the flour consumed in Canada, and can in 65 days make flour of every bushel of wheat grown in Canada, there's no danger that I can see of any one having a huge monopoly on a protective tariff of 26 cents. (Applause.)

Mr. Macdonald, of Collingwood: "We are here to-day for the purpose of considering the milling interests of this country, and it seems to me we ought to do so in a quieter and more business-like manner. If you go down to Ottawa and ask for \$1 per barrel specific duty, it seems to me you will be defeated. I am inclined to the opinion that we could get a specific duty equal to what the Americans have against us. Let me just say here, I would a great deal rather you got \$2 per barrel, but, of course, no one here would ask for that much. Now, if this meeting asks the Government to put just the same duty on flour coming into Canada as the Americans have put on our flour going into the States, I don't very clearly see how they could refuse. The Government must look at this question in the interests of the whole country, and not in the interests of the millers, or the farmers, or of any one body of people. It must be remembered that the present time is one at which it might not be wise of the Dominion Government to assume an aggressive stand against a Government now in power in the United States which has shown itself by no means friendly to Canada and to Great Britain, and on the eve of a great change in the American administration, it would be hardly right to allow any question of tariff, such as the present one, to embarrass the Government at Ottawa. I think if we ask for an *ad valorem* tariff of 20 per cent., we will get it, but of course if the majority of those present want a specific duty of \$1 per barrel, I am willing to go in for it to make it unanimous."

Mr. J. L. Spink: "I have attended similar meetings of this kind before, and have taken the matter up and discussed it with the Government on a delegation to Ottawa. As Mr. Plewes said, there has been no denial of the fact that we have been treated unjustly. But it is simply, as has been said, a question of votes. I remember being told while at Ottawa, that if we brought a deputation of 1,000 down there, the farmers would probably bring down 20,000. It is simply a question of votes, and nothing more. There is one point we have now we did not have before. The Government is interested in opening up the North-West, and I have no doubt something might be done by the C. P. R. interests down at Ottawa, if the arguments were put that way, and it were shown how much more Manitoba and North West wheat would be required down here in Ontario if American flour were kept out."

Mr. Caldwell, M. P. P. for Lanark: "Let us ask what we have a right to have, and no more, and then if we are refused, we can do something, for the public will feel we are under an injustice. If we make a moderate request of the Government, we will probably get it."

Mr. Plewes: "I don't advise being moderate. That's the way we did before, and we have paid for it, too. (Applause). Let the request we are making of the Government be a unanimous one, and we will have it granted if they see we are in earnest, for there can be no denying but that it is a moderate one."

Mr. Macdonald, of Collingwood: "If the majority of the meeting want the \$1 per barrel specific duty, I am perfectly satisfied to let it be so, and in fact would rather have it, but it would be better to ask for just 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, the same as the Americans have against us."

Mr. Snider, M. P. P., of St. Jacobs: "20 per cent. will be enough duty for us, and will give us a show against the Americans, for I think with that duty, we can compete with them very favorably."

Mr. Edmonson, Oshawa: "I favor the \$1 duty.

The Farmers' Institute of Oshawa held a meeting and expressed their opinion that we ought to get it. They were to have brought the matter up at the Central Institute here for approval. With respect to the 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, that would be in some cases less than 50 cents per barrel specific on low grades, and some low grades would even get in at 35 and 40 cents duty. I will vote for the \$1 specific duty."

The discussion here closed, and the resolution asking for a duty of \$1 per barrel was unanimously adopted.

SOME ADDITIONAL OPINIONS.

GALT, ONT., 28th Jan., 1889.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
DEAR SIRS, Your petitions were received this a.m. We think, however, that they do not go quite far enough. Our senior has been appointed as a delegate to go to Ottawa by the Western Millers' Association, and we are of opinion that the tariff should be equal to that of the United States, viz., \$1 per barrel. Do you not think it would be well for you to amend the figures in your petitions by making them equal to the amount charged by the American Government?

Yours truly,
TODD MILLING CO.

LONDON, ONT., Jan. 26th, 1889.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
GENTLEMEN, Your circular letter dated 2nd inst., also blank petitions for signatures came duly to hand. We will try and get them filled up and returned to you during the 1st week in February. You deserve the thanks of the millers of Ontario for the great trouble you have put yourself to in their behalf, and, if successful, we will send you to Parliament, provided you promise to keep all American flour out of the Dominion of Canada in future.

Yours truly,
HUNT BROTHERS.

ZURICH, Jan. 24th, 1889.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
DEAR SIRS, We have your letter, also petitions, of 23rd inst., which I quite understand. You say, have all these petitions signed. Now, (proposition No. 1) where duty on wheat is reduced 3 cents, an advance of ten on flour is no good. This will not keep Americans out of our market. Proposition No. 2 is about right in my estimation. We are willing to spend time and money on this object to make it a success.

Yours truly,
J. A. WILLIAMS & CO.

WALKERTON, FEB. 4th, 1889.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
DEAR SIRS, I return to-day to your address the petitions. Send them to H. Cargill, Esq., Ottawa, our member. I have spoken to him about them, and he is in favor of the object, being himself a miller. I hope it may do something for us.

Yours truly,
J. LEE.

HAMILTON, Feb. 16th, 1889.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
DEAR SIRS, Your card to hand and noted. Thanks for your kind invitation. Sorry I will be unable to attend. Hope you will have a good meeting, and appoint delegates that will have the desired effect when they go to Ottawa.

Yours truly,
JAS. DUNLOP.

SHERBROOKE, QUE., Jan. 28th, 1886.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
DEAR SIRS, With reference to the petition sheets you sent us, do you wish them filled on both sides? We have secured the names of all the prominent men in town, and if you want both sides filled, or would prefer the names on another sheet, let us hear, or send us new sheets and we will do as you wish at once. We heartily concur with this movement, and will do all in our power to make it a success as far as this district goes.

Yours truly,
MACFARLANE MILLING CO.

OSHAWA, Feb. 12th, 1889.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
DEAR SIRS, Re petition. The Oshawa Farmers' Institute passed a unanimous resolution asking the Government to place a duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on flour. The resolution will come out in the daily journals on Monday. The Central Institute will meet in the City Hall, Toronto, on Tuesday. There will be present delegates from every Farmers' Institute in the Province. Would advise that you get the very strongest deputation you possibly can, and press our petition on them for adoption. If you think it well to have the farmers co-operation, you may obtain it in this way.

Yours truly,
E. S. EDMONDSON.

DUNSVILLE, Feb. 18th, 1886.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
DEAR SIRS, I regret very much I cannot be at your meeting on Tuesday, as the scheme is a good one, and should be worked with all force possible. When through with it, I wish you or some of the millers present will form an Association for millers, electing necessary officers. I doubt if there is a miller in Ontario who would not become a member. We would, through an Association be able to cope with the "bear" element which exists in the provinces; also acquaint each other with many grievances now existing.

Yours truly,
JOHN MOODY.

FERGUS, Feb. 18th, 1889.

MESSRS. STARK BROS., Toronto.
DEAR SIRS, I regret exceedingly that I shall be unable to attend the millers' meeting on Tuesday, as I sympathize with the object in view. The present tariff is not only unfair to the Cana-