

from any angle you like, it is a fallacy, whether it is to increase prices in favour of the farmers or is intended to raise revenue. This editorial says:

A committee of experts employed by the Fair Tariff League of the United States have estimated that on the agricultural schedule farmers in the state of Kansas gain \$260,000 as producers and lose \$2,500,000 as consumers, while on manufactured goods the farmers of the State gain \$257,000 and lose \$30,000,000.

This committee has started a similar investigation in Nebraska and the farmers are beginning to see the nigger in the tariff woodpile. The time has about arrived when the Canadian farmer will no longer be the beast of burden of this nation as he has been in the past and will not suffer the taunts and insults that have been thrown at him by all other classes, including indeed some of the members of this House, simply because he seeks to make known the truth in regard to the conditions that surround him. Even the Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What is the trouble with the hon. gentleman?

Mr. EVANS: I was going to say that the Minister of Agriculture himself describes the statements of a patriotic minority who seek to make known the truth in this House as so much bluff; he regards it as a game, at which he was playing, some time ago himself. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) also says that the Progressive party has been wholly misled by false literature, and has been making reckless insinuations regardless of the facts. In other words, I suppose he means that they are too ignorant to know better. But the strange thing about agriculture these days is that no one knows anything about it except those who have never been at it, or those who have been at it and failed and have recently taken refuge, perhaps in the Civil Service, or in other branches of business, perhaps on some experimental farm or on some commission, or even, perhaps, in politics.

There is even unfairness to-day in the difference of attitude on the part of the government as between city and rural dwellers. Since confederation everything has been sacrificed in this country to the building up of the cities, and I believe that even in the Civil Service there is great unfairness and partiality as between the country and the city employees. I was asked to mention in this particular the plight of one class of men to-day who are not receiving a fair remuneration for their work, or anything that bears any comparison to the wages paid to a similar class of men in the Civil Service. I refer to

[Mr. Evans.]

the rural mail carriers. They are entitled to something more than they are getting. They are men who have to brave all kinds of weather and furnish their own outfit, and they are bound down by a contract to deliver their mail on time. I was asked to make a plea for them, and seeing the justice of their demand I do not hesitate to do so, nor do I apologize.

The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) declared that last year certain manufacturers realized the necessity for the restoration of the Crownest pass agreement and although this was against their own interests, the hon. member said, they were not complaining. As a matter of fact, all manufacturers have been depicted in this House as the most docile class of men, bearing with fortitude the hard conditions that are imposed upon them at the present time and never squealing. Well, why should they squeal? What have the manufacturers to complain of? Their will is dominant in this House. They have been served since 1879 submissively by the government of this country irrespective of party, and the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) declaring that they have been served better by the present government than under his régime, quoted a list of farm implements which have been increased in price in proof of that assertion.

From the Progressive standpoint, the whole controversy that has taken place in this debate,—all the speeches delivered yesterday, able and eloquent speeches, by the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and others—has been as to which party has been serving the big interests the best, which has been most faithful to the principle of protection. Sir Richard Cartwright declared at the Ottawa Convention in 1893, as reported at page 42 of the official report of that convention, that up to that time, after only thirteen years of the National Policy, hardly less than \$1,000,000,000 had been filched from the pockets of the people for the purpose of entrenching the oppressors of this nation in power and enabling them to defeat the wishes of the people. What have they to complain of? By a law they were made the wards of this nation in 1879, and by 1897 they had become its masters; and since then the government of this country has been, irrespective of party, obedient to all their wishes. That \$1,000,000,000 represents more than the whole of the indemnity that Germany dared to impose upon France after the war of 1871; the total sum which the victors dared exact from a vanquished nation of forty millions was taken from the pockets of the Canadian people during the first thirteen years of the Na-