

...the loss and imprisonment of the Minister of Customs is so heavily impending for that? If not, why do it for? Is it just for the sake of being caught? It must be just as they like it. Everything is as it was here as over there, and the men are to have the fun of the Minister catching them. That can be the only reason. Now, we come to look at the effect of the tariff upon

The Farmers.

The Finance Minister was very strong on the subject of the benefit which the tariff had been to the farmers. He pointed out some statistics, and I could not help following him in some of the figures he used, taking certain years to suit himself, but he alleged that we have been able to export on the average of certain years \$9,371,756 per annum more of agricultural products than we did on an average during a certain number of years under the Mackenzie Administration. In addition to that he asserts that he has opened the home market to the farmers to the extent of \$5,500,000 a year; or that they were able to export, in consequence of the operation of the tariff, \$13,000,000 more in the year 1885 than they were in the year 1878. Well, now, what do we understand by an argument of that kind? If it means anything, and if it is to have any force, it must be that the tariff that they imposed for the benefit of the farmer, as they say, has enabled the farmer to raise more product than he was able to, or to raise the price of his product in the foreign market; because if he has \$13,000,000 worth a year more of product, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman. Does he solemnly intend to say that the operation of the tariff has enabled the farmer to grow more than he was able to grow, or that grain in foreign countries? That is the meaning of it, and yet it is impossible to believe that an intelligent man would take that position. I should like to believe that it is so, but the gentleman told us that, as

one of the effects of his tariff, while in 1878, the oxen were idle in the stall, and the ploughshare was rusting in the field, when he put a duty on agricultural products, the oxen forthwith came out of the stall, and was immediately yoked to the plough again. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his illustration from. I do not know what part of the country he had been travelling in. In the first place, in 1878, in the portion of the country in which I lived, horses were more in use for ploughing purposes than oxen, and I had fancied that they were largely used for that purpose throughout the Dominion. And, more than that, if it be a fact that some of the farmers did use oxen, and were not engaged in ploughing because ploughing would not pay, that they had abandoned farming because it produced no profits, I still think that the farmers would have had sense enough not to keep an ox in the stall and feed him there, when they could turn him out to graze; because, I submit, Mr. Speaker, for your consideration, the fact that, greatly as this tariff has benefited the agriculturists, and badly off as they were before its introduction, the grass did grow, in 1878, and the ox could have grazed if they had turned him out; also, in 1878, if ploughing did not pay, the farmers had that sense of economy that they would never have left the plough in the field for the share to rust, but would have put it in the barn or the shed where it would have been exposed to no such danger, as the hon. member for Essex knows quite well. So the hon. gentleman is altogether astray in his illustration. I do not know where he has been, but he has been out of Canada, and it does not apply to our country at all. But it struck me, when he allowed his fancy to indulge in that flight, or when he was taking credit for the tariff, that he had found a patent by which the oxen could be set to work with the plough, that he was looking in a direction the way in which he gave us in the opening portion of his speech, when he said that he had succeeded in his present position.