

tions made by hon. members with regard to the importance of agriculture, I am somewhat disappointed to find that expenditures on agriculture are limited in the Estimates to approximately \$5,000,000, while the expenditures for, say, the Department of Militia amount to \$11,750,000. That is not bearing out in practice that which is preached in theory. If I were as big a man intellectually and physically as the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Finance would not frighten me; I would demand that agriculture receive its proper share of the appropriations. I have received many letters from my people in my constituency demanding a more equitable distribution of the funds available and asking that agriculture should receive its share. I repeat that our people heartily approve the efforts that are being put forth by the Department of Agriculture in an effort to combat the pests that are attacking our crops. I believe this evil is largely extant in our country because the minister is circumscribed in his sphere or in the amount of capital he has to invest in combatting it. While I am prepared to support a general policy of retrenchment, yet I believe the proportions are absolutely unfair to the great industry of agriculture in this country.

Mr. FOURNIER: I have a little bit of criticism to offer to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie), not that he is not spending money, but that he is not spending enough money for agricultural purposes. I have the same complaint as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) has. The amount spent yearly for the destruction of destructive insects is a miserable pittance, when we realize that parasites are destroying crops to an amount estimated at \$125,000,000 yearly. The amount expended for good seed is altogether too small when one considers that an increase of one bushel per acre in Canada's crop would add about \$80,000,000 to the country's wealth, and that is something worth considering. As regards the amount expended for agricultural instruction, it is a shame that such a small amount should be asked. In the midst of the social and economic battles which are being fought between nations in order to regain their equilibrium there is no more important and essential problem than that of agriculture. For the last six years, the great cry has been "Back to the land", that is to say, back to the economic truth. That cry has been heard by sound economists, bankers, railroad directors and business men

generally, but what do we find? With such a small amount expended for agriculture, we find that the tide for the last thirty years has been flowing to the cities, and I submit, Sir, the more farmers, the more of everything,—railways, factories, towns, cities, churches, colleges, art schools, conservatories, music and all the apparatus and appurtenances of the highest civilization. The Government apparently does not desire such a condition, and with a lack of encouragement, the rural population is fast declining.

Agriculture should be the domain of high politics, politics of the first order, and I ask the minister, when he goes to the Council chamber, as solid as he is, to have the Estimates of his department approved, not to be too shy with his colleagues. If I were in his place, I would soon get a little money out of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Militia, and the Minister of Railways and Canals. In private or in public affairs nothing goes forward if one is not able to display the necessary will, even to the point of being audacious. All those who work for the future must determine the scope of individual will and collective will as well. To move the collective will, politics should formulate, on essential points, principles and reforms that all groups must admit. It is necessary that vital questions should not fall the prey of faction, nor of ambitions. And vital questions are those which make national greatness and prosperity,—the moral value of population, social justice and material prosperity. To bring collective will to these questions, politics must bring forward sentiments and common interests, sentiments of generosity, justice and courage, interests of social and economic order. I commend these words to the minister.

Before resuming my seat, I wish to make a slight reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best), when he was at his "best" yesterday evening. The hon. gentleman stated that many hon. gentlemen speak of farming when they know absolutely nothing about it. I must differ from that statement, so far as my part of the country is concerned. We closely observe the eleventh commandment which says: "Thou shalt mind thine own business." We do not care who goes on the land, whether it is an honourable judge, a lawyer, a physician, a notary or anyone else; in fact, we welcome anyone on the land, and we know that many things that are to-day employed in agriculture were not invented by farmers. The man who invented Paris green was a chemist,