

knows what happens when out in the North-west a stone is flung by any one at a dog and the dog follows it meaninglessly ; just as meaninglessly as my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) tries to bite at an old chestnut now. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it was in consequence of my action that the tariff was revised in 1894. I call the attention of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) to this ; I call the attention of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to it ; I call the attention of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) to it ; I call the attention of any of the independent members, I call the attention of the so-called Patrons, if there is a shred of patronism, if there is a shred of independence left in them ; I call their attention to the fact that a Government does not care very much about the opposition that comes to it from the straight Opposition in the House, because the attack of the straight Opposition is discounted by the fact that it is its business to criticise and oppose. But the moment a man from behind a Government, a follower of the Government ; the moment he stands up and expresses his opinion that a certain course contrary to their policy should be taken, that moment the Government pays attention to it. Although, of course, I have a very great respect for the abilities of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and a great respect for the abilities of my hon. friends from the west, still I do not say that their abilities are overpowering and gigantic. But, Sir, there is not one of these western Liberal members who cannot accomplish more than any twenty men on this side of the House if they will only stand up and fearlessly express the opinions of the people in that western country whence they come.

My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) said to me, why did I not discover this state of things ? Well, Sir, if I did not discover it, his friends, whom he is now following, discovered it. In the very pamphlet to which I have referred they set out a comparison between the farmer and the manufacturer to which I will call his attention as very interesting and instructive. This is the pamphlet on which the fight was fought in the province of Ontario and all over the country ; it is the programme of the Liberal party, and, under the heading of "Manufacturers' Profits and Farmers' Profits," it says :

The question is sometimes asked, why are farm lands decreasing in value ? They are decreasing for the same reason that other stocks decrease—because the profit, after the expense of working them is paid, is so small.

Then it points out that according to the census of 1891 the manufacturers' profit was 34 per cent on a capital invested of \$353,000,000 ; while the farmers' investment for the year 1892, according to the Ontario Bureau of Industries, was \$979,000,000, and the net pro-

ceeds amounted to only \$114,000,000. So that according to the case made out by the campaign sheet of the Liberal party the farmer deserves special consideration at our hands. But what does the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who, as a rule, leads this House, say on this subject ? He said it here in 1894, when we were about to legislate :

The produce of the farmer has been driven to the lowest point, but what he has to buy is sold to him at an increased price, as compared with the price in England. The farmer is bound by his circumstances to sell in the freest and cheapest market ; so also ought he to be privileged to buy in the cheapest market, consistent only with the imposition of such duties as are necessary for raising the revenue of the country. That is a proposition perfectly fair, perfectly just, perfectly equitable—so fair, so just, so reasonable and so equitable that the Government dare not attack it openly. And yet they cannot adopt it. Why ? Because they are chained and yoked to a system which is the reverse of just and fair and equitable.

These are the words of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and they apply to the present Government. That is the system they are carrying out now. In the Railway Committee yesterday the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) declared that if the present tariff was not high enough, he would be in favour of a tariff—and he would introduce a Railway Act to enable him to bring it into force by Order in Council—that would fully protect the people in the Boundary Creek country. The Minister of Railways says that, but mark the language of his leader :

And yet they cannot adopt it. Why ? Because they are chained and yoked to a system which is the reverse of just and fair and equitable.

That language went to the west in 1894. What were the farmers to think ? When the right hon. gentleman went west himself, the "Globe" had a picture of him bending over the North-west farmer, whose hands were manacled and gyved by the very tariff which is in force to-day ; and there we had the right hon. gentleman depicted as knocking off the chains and fetters of the poor North-western farmer. We had another picture—a picture of the man who fell among thieves, also the North-west farmer ; and there was the Good Samaritan, Wilfrid Laurier, bending over him and pouring the oil of joy and gladness into his wounds. But what the poor man who fell among thieves got from the right hon. gentleman was bottles of wind, vials of sunny ways of vapidty ; his promise to the North-west having proved of no more value than a dicer's oath. I want to show you, Sir, the disappointment that was felt. I have here the opinion of Duncan Marshall, who gives the views of the Patrons of Ontario, when they saw this tariff : "It is disappointing to the farmers who had been promised substantial changes from the party