

that the farmers had no grievances whatever. Then they divided the job. The two Controllers, the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue, took the province of Ontario; the Minister of Agriculture took the North-west Territories; and I am bound to say for the Minister of Finance, who displayed great activity, that he took the whole Dominion for his operations. Well, the Controller of Inland Revenue and the Controller of Customs proved to the farmers of Ontario that they were blessed with prosperity. It was true, they did not see it, or feel it, or enjoy it; but it was there all the same, and they would feel it if they would have full faith in this paternal Government. As to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, when he came to the North-west, he was bound to admit that the farmers were not in a very prosperous condition, but after all he told them it was all their own fault. What if they were taxed on their lumber? What if they were taxed on their binding twine or their agricultural implements? What if they were taxed on everything they consumed? If they were taxed, it was their own fault. The panacea was not in the tariff. It was on every hand: mixed farming was the thing that would save them and lift them out of the slough in which they were struggling. I am proud of my profession when I see what a good Minister of Agriculture a lawyer can make, and how much of agriculture a lawyer knows—much more than a farmer would imagine. For instance, how was it possible that the farmers of the North-west could, of themselves, conceive that the remedy for their evils lay to such an extent in their own hands. They never could have thought of it. But as soon as a lawyer, who happens to be, at this moment, Minister of Agriculture, points out mixed farming as the remedy, they exclaim: How stupid we were not to have thought of that. But I am bound to say that the Minister of Agriculture did not act fairly towards his predecessor, the hon. gentleman who to-day represents the city of London (Mr. Carling), for that hon. gentleman said not only that mixed farming was the panacea, but also that two-rowed barley was the thing that was going to save us. Our present Minister of Agriculture forgot the two-rowed barley. Now, as regards the Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), he went from the east to the south, and the west, and everywhere he went he proved to the farmers that they have no grievances whatever. He lectured them on the beauties and advantages of protection, and then he preached to them a great sermon on the necessity of people paying their taxes. He said it was the duty of all good Christians, and especially good Christian farmers, to submit to the evil of taxation. Why, my hon. friend was not as generous as that other Minister of Finance of whom I read a moment ago. A French Minister of Finance, after the Restoration,

Mr. LAURIER.

M. de Villèle, imposed frequent and heavy taxation on the people, and the people sometimes remonstrated. One of the comic papers represented the Minister armed with a long knife, and wearing the traditional white apron and cap of a chef, surrounded by a brood of chickens. He spoke to the brood in this way: Chickens, with what sauce would you prefer to be eaten? But, they said: We do not want to be eaten at all. Oh, said he, you are begging the question; I am consulting you as to the sauce you would like to be eaten with. Our Minister of Finance did not consult the chickens even on this important point, but told them that the sauce was to be protection, and allowed them no choice. Well, Mr. Speaker, after all those interviews, the Government were just as much at sea as to what they should do with regard to the tariff as they were before. When they came back to Ottawa, they apparently did not know any more than when they went forth, because as soon as they got back they were followed by long processions from the very places they had just visited, composed of the same men they had just been interviewing. The Minister had gone to feel their pulse, and now they came in their turn to feel the pulse of the Minister. They came to feel his pulse and to steady his nerves, and, above all, to exact the pound of flesh; and, judging from the words the Minister has put in the mouth of His Excellency, they have indeed obtained their pound of flesh. There is to be no reform whatever. The system is to be continued, which has prevailed for some years, of levying taxes, not to go into the public exchequer, but into private purses—of imposing duties, not with the view of raising a revenue, but with the view of taxing one portion of the community for the benefit of another. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Sir James Grant) said a moment ago that he expected that the Government would, in their wisdom, provide protection for all classes. I am sure they will. I have read the speech which my hon. friend the Prime Minister made a few days ago in this city. In that speech he proclaimed himself much more of a protectionist than I had even supposed he was. Why, he is going to protect all kinds of labour, even professional labour; he is going to protect even the lawyers and doctors. Let me read to you his words:

Now, our position is that what promotes the welfare of the industrial classes is good for all; that the prime object is to promote the labour of the country, and to see that the work which has to be done is done by Canadians. This is the goal we should endeavor to reach. Whether it is the labour of the farmer, the mechanic, the professional man, or the manufacturer, the grand aim we should keep in view is that labour is the basis of the welfare of the country.

So, if we are to have protected labour among the provisions, I denounce the First Minister