

least \$5 per acre land in Manitoba, and the other western provinces and he thought it would increase a great deal more.

Mr. STAPLES. Did Mr. Riddell tell you his opinion which he gathered abroad? Did he tell you what feeling existed in the old country regarding this reciprocity measure? Did he tell you that in his opinion conditions were quite satisfactory in this country, and this government would be very foolish to disturb them?

Mr. MOLLOY. I would like to inform my hon. friend that he told me just exactly the opposite. He told me that it would benefit, not only the people of Manitoba, but of all western Canada, and that the people were only getting what the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Staples) has told us he had fought for ever since he has been a member of this House.

It is well known that this year was an unfavourable year for Manitoba, and yet we raised in that province 96,000,000 bushels of grain, of which 40,000,000 bushels were wheat. That was raised from an acreage of 3,110,000 acres, with the small average of 13½ bushels per acre. Now, there are at least 25,000,000 acres of land arable in the province of Manitoba alone. Last year the United Kingdom imported 163,000,000 bushels of wheat, and that 25,000,000 acres of land, which is deemed to be arable in Manitoba alone would yield 325,000,000 bushels of wheat at 13 bushels per acre. The question with which I am concerned is this: We know that in western Canada there will be some day from 175,000,000 to 200,000,000 acres of land under development, and I would ask where will the people of western Canada go to sell their surplus wheat, oats and barley when that day comes?

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. gentleman think they will find it in the United States, which is an exporting country to-day?

Mr. MOLLOY. Yes, it is an exporting country to-day, and will be, perhaps, for a short time, but only for a very short time, and the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite that if we had waited the United States would have taken down their tariff barriers, is not really an argument against this agreement, because by this agreement these barriers are being taken down. I do not pretend that it will increase the price of wheat to the Canadian producer, but I say it will maintain the present prices. There are those who say it will increase the price 2 cents or 3 cents per bushel, but I shall be well satisfied if the present prices are maintained, because at the prices of to-day the raising of wheat is one of the best paying businesses in the Dominion. Instead of having only a home market and

the British market, we shall have the United States market as well, and can any one doubt that with three markets at his command instead of two the producer will benefit? Say, for instance, that the price of No. 1 Northern is 76 cents, and of No. 2 Northern 70 cents. It is well known that there may be but a very slight degree of difference between the two, and that if that grain is sampled what may be refused as No. 1 Northern may bring 75 cents.

So far as the western farmer is concerned we know that this agreement must be a good thing for him if we judge it from the American point of view, because we know that the ablest men connected with the farming industry in the United States are opposing it on the ground that the United States government have maintained protection for the manufacturers and have made the tillers of the soil free traders. In proof of this, let me read an extract from a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Wilson from former Governor Nahum J. Bachelder, of Concord, N.H.:

In reply to our statement that the pending Bill was one-sided and unfair to the farmers, in that it makes no material reduction in duties on manufactured articles used by them, you attempt to defend the continuance of a high tariff for manufacturers along with free trade for the farmers, by claiming that it is the protected workers who furnish the farmers with their chief market.

We would respectfully submit that you are simply repeating the pet argument of the domestic manufacturer and that in asserting that the prosperity of the farmer depends on the workers in protected industries, you are claiming what is exactly the reverse of actual conditions. It is on the prosperity of the farmers that the welfare of all other classes—manufacturers, merchants, transportation interests and factory workers, depends, and we cannot understand how at this late day you should be found repeating the stale and exploded theory that the farmers exist by the grace of protected manufacturers, or any one else on earth.

I say, therefore, that when men in the position to make such a statement as whose letter I have just read, who is at the head of the National Grange and chairman of the Patrons of Industry, are in a position to make such a statement as that, this reciprocity must be a good thing for our western farmer, and if it be good for them it will benefit the whole Dominion.

Some time ago we were all struck with an article which appeared on the front page of the Montreal 'Star,' in which that paper appealed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier as the only man who could save Canada. Well, we on this side believe that he has been the only man for a generation, who has done that which is best for Canada, and who will continue to do so as long as God spares him, regardless of the fact that it was a paid advertisement, regardless of the fact