

that measure of protection which will enable men and money to be employed in Canada; we do not ask for any more than that. Should any interest or any hon. member ask for more? Should any interest or any hon. member expect less? This stability clause is evidently a stumbling block to our friends to the left. It is perhaps a new Liberal doctrine, one never before propounded, and not at all in my judgment in keeping with the one presented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) last year. I refer to Hansard of last session at page 2843 wherein the Minister of Finance uses the following words:

I say, in all sincerity, that this budget ought to commend itself to our Progressive friends, not as a finality, not as something that is entirely in line with their own views, but as something which follows the right direction, and, so far as it goes it should have their cordial support.

There is nothing whatever in that about tariff stability, and I am not at all surprised that my friends to my left are disappointed that this stability clause has been inserted. This new doctrine of the Liberal party evidently has just a little too much kick in it for my friends to my left; and there is a suspicion that like another article of commerce of considerable strength, it has its source in Montreal.

In my opinion the most serious feature of the budget is its failure to balance. I am well aware of the many claims which there are upon the revenue of this country, but it is over four years since the war concluded and it seems to me that the time has come when in the interest of the country we should be able to balance revenue and expenditure. I know, too, that it would not be popular at the present time to increase taxation. But there are two methods by which the budget of the private individual, the corporation of the country itself may be balanced; one is an increased revenue and the other a decrease of expenditure. I fully realize the difficulties that present themselves to public men in positions of responsibility when they attempt to keep down expenditure. But I remember, as well, that this government, before they attained power, urged that this should be done. The war was over, they said, and the government of that day should balance the budget. Yet, after two sessions in office, the present Minister of Finance still tells us that there will be a heavy increase in the debt this year and we must look forward to another increase next year. This is a matter for serious reflection on the part of every hon.

[Mr. Stansell.]

gentleman. Surely some method might be adopted of curtailing expenditures in order to make the budget balance. A great deal might have been accomplished to encourage immigration and restore confidence in the country if heroic measures had been adopted in this respect, so that the attention of the world might be directed to the condition in which Canada should be financially to-day. Among the various criticisms which might be directed at the provisions of the budget, I am convinced that this is one of the most serious, and now, their second session in power, hon. gentlemen opposite should have made some earnest attempt to bring down to the House a balanced budget with a promise of a reduction of debt for the year to come.

Let me direct a few words to a subject of great importance, namely, agriculture. I listened with interest to the speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) a few nights ago and I recalled a statement attributed to the present Minister of Finance—that responsibility sobers men. After listening to the sober reflections, of about three hours' duration, of the Minister of Agriculture, in which he dealt with various subjects including razor-back hogs and dunghill hens and many other things, from the fear of God to the crack of doom, I wondered in what frame of mind the hon. gentleman was before he sobered up. Among other bits of advice that he offered to hon. members of the farming profession on my left, one thing which struck me was his exhortation to pray for rain. He tendered this as a solution of some of the difficulties of the farmer to-day. Well, Sir, in my judgment, if the farming interest in this country was not considered a fit subject for prayer when the minister arose, the House must have been fully seized of the necessity before he sat down.

There is one subject connected with agriculture on which I desire to say something, and that is the accredited herd system operated under the Department of Agriculture. This is something the importance of which has been stressed many times on the floor of the House, and some criticism has been offered because the valuation has been lowered. In my opinion the valuation was not too high, but the trouble was that in many cases an ordinary animal was valued up to the maximum. The real need of reform lay in the proper valuation of animals under the system that we had. I am well aware, however, that the process of accrediting the pure-bred herds of the country is one that entails a tremendous amount of money and is a great drain on the revenues of Canada, and therefore I wish to