

ture dares to get up here and say that he is not here to listen to them. I say he is here to listen to them, he must listen to them, and this House must listen to them.

In speaking of the value of the farm products of the west, I have not said anything about the stock holdings there which roughly are as follows :

	Horses.	Cattle.	Sheep and hogs.
Manitoba ..	\$24,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$11,500,000
Saskatchewan ..	35,000,000	10,000,000	1,500,000
Alberta ..	24,000,000	20,000,000	1,000,000

Showing a total of \$116,000,000 worth of stock, and yet the Minister of Agriculture, who is here representing the farmers, says that we are not here to listen to those people, but that we will make the appointment as we choose. I hold that these farmers have to be listened to. They have the right to be listened to. They are the wealth producers of the great western country, and were it not for them there would not need to be a railway commission at all. I have not taken into consideration the fact that millions of dollars worth of property are owned by the farmers of Canada. The farm buildings and real estate owned by the farmers of Canada, as quoted by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), amount in value to—buildings—\$395,000,000 and—real estate—\$1,007,000,000. Surely that is a sufficient reason for asking this government to consider the claims of the farmers in this regard. When the late Hon. Thos. Greenway received the appointment this government congratulated themselves and pointed out to the people of Canada that they had appointed to that position a man who was a practical farmer. They said, prior to the election: We have put an actual farmer into that position to look after your interests. What do they say now? The Minister of Agriculture derides hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who get up and make the suggestion that what the farmers ask for should be granted. To be accurate I wrote down the words of the Minister of Agriculture with reference to a computation, amounting to half a million dollars, made by my hon. friend from Macdonald and the words of the minister were these: 'However, that is as near as he can get to the actual facts.' I leave it to any member of this House to say if, in our experience, since we have been going through the estimates this year, it is possible to get any minister nearer to the actual facts than that. I think that if he came within a quarter of a million at a guess he would be very lucky. The Minister of Agriculture went on to apply the tu quoque argument and to say that the census, the archives, and the patents were introduced into the Department of Agri-

culture by the Tories. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have been twelve years in power. They condemned everything we did when we were in power and they have had twelve years to correct these things, but they have not done it, and they use them as excuses for their own misdoings. When you plant twigs in a nursery and they grow up there comes a certain time when they must be transplanted, and we are trying to tell the Minister of Agriculture that it is now time to transplant and to allow of a maturer and larger growth of those matters which concern the farming interests. That is what the farmers are asking. The hon. gentleman, instead of agreeing, as he should have agreed, being the Minister of Agriculture, with many of the things said by the gentleman who preceded him in the debate, sneered at him for lauding the farmers. It is the laughing stock of Canada that the Minister of Agriculture poses as a farmer. It is time he knew it and I am glad to tell him if he did not know it before. The only kind of farmer that he is is the kind that farms the farmers and that is the wrong kind for a Minister of Agriculture. He establishes chicken fattening stations and says to the farmers wives that if they spend about ten cents more per lb. on a chicken than they can possibly get for it on the market, they will be successful. That is the kind of a Minister of Agriculture he is. He is the kind that sits there in his seat and allows the Department of Militia to grasp the public money that ought to be spent for the benefit of the farmers instead of being spent in making—shall I say—carpet knights. There is no money available for the advancement of the interests of the farmers, who are the greatest wealth producers of the country. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) reprimanded hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for having introduced politics into the debate. I want to tell that hon. gentleman that I never in my life saw any one follow a bad example to a greater extent than he has done. He handed out a very nice certificate of character in the first place to himself, and later on to the Minister of Agriculture, and he said that he regretted the attack, the onslaught, that was made on the Minister of Agriculture, whom he described as a very mild mannered man. I would bring to his attention a quotation from Ralph Balderwood which, to my mind, possibly applies to his description of the Minister of Agriculture. Sir Ralph Balderwood, in speaking of a very bad character, said:

A milder mannered man never cut a throat or scuttled a ship.

Having reference to the present occasion, I think the hon. gentleman will admit that