

there was no market for any of that produce.

Take the province of Quebec—my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture is going to follow me, I believe, and he, of course, knows infinitely more about farming in the province of Quebec than I do—but I am going to ask him to address himself to one question in connection with this agreement, because I have not been able to get any light on it in favour of the treaty, and if there is any light to be thrown on it I would like to get it. The province of Quebec has bright prospects before it at the present time. Our transportation system is growing so enormously; the city of Montreal is growing so enormously; the prospects of the pulp and paper industry are so good that unquestionably in the province of Quebec in a few years there will be an enormous home market—perhaps the largest home market of any province in the Dominion.

#### FARMING IN QUEBEC.

The province is not very well farmed at the present time—there is good farming in some parts of it, there is poor farming in a good portion of it, and moderate farming in other portions of it. The agricultural problem of the province of Quebec is to induce the farmer to keep his hay at home and to follow a system of intensive farming. This is the agricultural problem of the province of Quebec. Lately we had the Deputy Minister of the Department of Agriculture for Ontario at Quebec; he came there at my special request to deliver a carefully prepared address upon the subject of the improvement of agriculture in the province of Ontario, explaining at great length and with great care the magnificent system of agricultural education and improvement which has lately developed in the province of Ontario as the result of 20 or 25 years of laborious work, which is now approaching its period of fruition in that province and beginning to have its influence felt.

#### SITUATION IN NORTH WEST.

We wanted it explained in Quebec city, and we had it explained, and we are printing thousands of copies of Mr. James' address in the French language and circulating them in the province of Quebec for the purpose of getting the authorities of the province of Quebec to undertake an aggressive movement for the improvement of agriculture. What happens—comes along this treaty and puts a bonus on poor farming by inducing the farmers of the province of Quebec to ship their raw products to New England, and deplete the fertility of their soil.

Take the prairie provinces—I am perfectly aware of the fact that there are a great many people in the western provinces who

think that this treaty will be a great thing for them. I have before seen premature conclusions arrived at in the course of 23 years in public life during which I have had an experience that not many members of the House have had because I have the honour of representing to-day in this House the same people who elected me first as a young man to the Legislature of Manitoba, and in the Legislature or in this Parliament I have been their representative ever since. During that time I have seen a good many questions of this kind come up as to what was going to benefit the farmer and as to what would be in his interests, and I am not so sure, when this question comes to be discussed, that the farmers of the North West will be impervious to reason and common sense and good judgment when they get the case put before them.

#### IS J. J. HILL RIGHT?

It was first said: But the farmer of the North West is going to get more for his wheat; the price of wheat south of the line in Dakota is higher than it is in Manitoba. That is true. It is a little higher; it always or nearly always rules a little higher, and they said: If the farmer can get into that market he will get more for his wheat. Now comes along Mr. Hill, the president of the Great Northern Railway, who is a great advocate of reciprocity and a very fine man and in a way a friend of my own, and he says: The duty does not make any difference; it is true the Dakota farmer gets a little more for his wheat, but it is not on account of the duty, it is on account of the local circumstances. Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hill is either right or he is wrong; there are just two ways to look at it. If he is right and the duty does not make any difference, then the Manitoba farmer will not get any more for his wheat when the duty is taken off. That's clear. If he is wrong and the duty does make a difference what is going to happen? Why, what is going to happen is this: That so soon as the immense exportable surplus of the Canadian North West is let into the Dakota market then the Dakota man's wheat goes down to the export level, and the Dakota man gets less, but the Manitoba man does not get any more. There is no doubt about that; it has happened already. Here is the New York "Evening Post" of February 16, and as everybody knows the New York "Evening Post" is a most reliable paper, and this is what it says, speaking of wheat:

#### WHEAT WILL GO.

"As matters stand now values are off over 24 cents from the season's top. The range on May wheat this season has been from \$1.15 to 90¢ cents, the highest price having been made November 4. With the adoption of the treaty there would be about