

standard of comfort enjoyed by these men. Now, Sir, there are important questions underlying this whole subject, to which the hon. gentleman would do well to attend. There is evidence in such statements as I have made—and that evidence comes to us from every quarter of the country—which goes to show that the hon. gentleman has done two things likely to be attended in the future with great mischief, for this country. He has sensibly lowered the standard of comfort among the working people, and he has to a very large extent, by artificial legislation, interfered with the due distribution of property, without adding one farthing to the national wealth collectively. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows, or the hon. gentleman ought to know, that all over the world at this moment thoughtful men, men of the highest station, of the highest intellectual attainments, are most desirous to see how, if it be possible by law, great fortunes may be prevented from being artificially created, and the proper distribution of great fortunes may be ensured, and he might, if he chose, learn from the straits to which our friends in the Mother Country are reduced, the risk of artificially creating great fortunes by operation of law. Now, Sir, I have no objection whatever to any man accumulating as large a fortune as he can by any honest and legitimate means. I do not mean to say that I regard it as the highest aim and object of life; and I may say this, that if that be regarded as the highest end and object of life we would not be engaged in politics, for my experience in politics is this, that although many men have entered office rich and left it poor, no honest and honorable man ever entered office poor and left it rich. But, Sir, be that as is may, my objection to his whole policy lies here, that what he has been doing is, as I said, to take many millions from the great mass of the people and to divide it among a very small and favored few. I do not mean to say that there is not something, in a political sense, to be said for the policy. The men among whom you are distributing the millions are likely to help you at election times. They may control votes, very likely, and very often they do, and no doubt, Sir, as in old times, the public may be debauched by the free use of part of the money which has been previously taken from them. But I do not regard that as statesmanship. I do not regard that as an honest policy. Nor do I believe, whatever the hon. Minister may say, that that is a policy which is likely to be attended with any great ultimate advantage to the country. Now, the hon. gentleman was extremely anxious to have us show what ground we had for our allegation that he was unjust to the farmers of Canada. Sir, I might remind him of the promises made, if not by him, at any rate by his followers and friends, that these farmers should most undoubtedly obtain better prices than those paid in the United States. The hon. gentleman himself must know that that is not the case, because he devoted a long and labored argument to show why it was that to-day prices are lower in Toronto than they are in Chicago. Well, Sir, I think the farmers of Canada will require some better explanation than the hon. gentleman has given to satisfy them that there can be any just cause for the condition of things which I find recorded at present as existing between these plans. Ordinarily speaking, Sir, in the days when my hon. friend was Premier, there was a very material difference in favor of Toronto against the Chicago markets. I take the dates of the 11th September, 1878, and I find there, Sir, that in Toronto wheat stood higher than in Chicago from 10 cents to 13 cents, that the market stood higher for oats about 8 cents, and for rye 11 cents. I turn to the date of January, 1882, and I find that the 13 cents advance have shrunk up to 4 cents. That oats are positively 3 cents lower in Toronto than in Chicago, and I find that rye is 10 cents lower and barley is 27 cents lower. Now, Sir, I would not say—I never have said, that the hon. gentleman's policy was solely responsible for that, but I do say that the onus lies on

these gentlemen who promised farmers better terms—who promised them better prices—that the onus lies on them to show how it is that the promises were so completely and totally reversed, and after three years' experience of the National Policy prices of cereals are absolutely lower in our own markets than in the markets of the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman has one advantage, when he talks of the way in which taxes affect farmers. Very few farmers—very few people in any class of life keep accurate accounts of their expenditure. I find it a matter of great difficulty to obtain any reliable statements from my farming friends as to the amount that they purchase of dutiable articles, and as to the way the Tariff affects them. Nevertheless I have succeeded in finding one or two, and with the permission of the House I will call their attention to the way in which the present taxation affects our farmers when carrying on operations on anything like a considerable scale. I have here a statement in detail from an extremely respectable farmer of my own acquaintance, having a family of nine, in which he states that he has expended in the last year for clothing, dry-goods, millinery of all kinds, about \$180; for hardware, \$58; for a variety of agricultural implements, \$180; harness, \$40; for tea and sugar, \$53; and for miscellaneous dutiable goods about \$60, making in all about \$571. I do not mean to say that this man is an ordinary example; he is a farmer of more than ordinary intelligence and of more than ordinary income; but I say this, that it is quite clear, applying the Tariff to the various classes of articles I have enumerated, that this man is contributing far more than his fair proportion of that duties to the revenue. I should estimate the taxes which man has to pay, at certainly not less than \$150 a year, and I am quite well aware that there are a great many farmers, at any rate, in that part of the world where he resides, who are obliged to pay quite as much, and some even a larger sum to our revenue. Sir, when I listen to the hon. gentleman's enumeration of his gifts by the Tariff to the farmer, and when I remember what the cost is, that these farmers had to pay, my mind reverts to a certain story of a famous American, which the hon. gentleman may perhaps have heard of. I will take the liberty Sir, of calling his attention to the anecdote in question. Once upon a time, so Mr. Barnum relates, he found himself in desperate straits—he had no money, no credit, his character even was under a cloud—some petty difficulty about a contract, I believe, I do not know what; at any rate, Mr. Barnum was morally and financially nearly dead beat. Well, Sir, he goes on to narrate how, in this hour of extremest need, a brilliant inspiration, a flash of genius struck across him, and he determined to start a lottery on an entirely new principle. His lottery was to have no blanks, all were to be prizes—all classes, farmers, mechanics, merchants, importers and manufacturers, all were to have prizes in Mr. Barnum's lottery; and he also goes on to relate with great gusto how a very long time elapsed before the men who obtained prizes in this lottery discovered that the prizes on the average were worth about one-tenth of the cost of the lottery ticket. Well, Sir, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman or his chief has ever heard the story; if they did not copy Mr. Barnum in this particular it would only be one of the numerous instances with which history is studded, which show us how great minds, when they find themselves in similar difficulties, are apt to resort to similar expedients in order to get out of them. The hon. gentleman, to-day, informed us that he was about to make a new departure in political economy in this country at least. He is going to give, so he tells us, a bounty of considerable amount to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. Now, Sir, knowing how grievously oppressive his Tariff has been to that most deserving class of the community, knowing how much they have suffered under it, knowing how utterly impossible it is for him to help them, I do not know, Sir,