

The government could not spend any money for building a transcontinental highway; they could not spend any money on technical education to help the sons of the poor man, but when it comes to beautifying the city of Ottawa, they can pull down buildings at a cost of over \$3,000,000 in order that you can get a bird's eye view of a little corner of the parliament buildings from the eastern end of the grounds.

Then we have our magnificent tariff board, costing this country \$200,000 a year. If the Prime Minister would give the boys a bag of marbles and tell them to go out and play with them and have a good time, they would accomplish just about as much of useful work as this tariff board has done.

Then we have Mr. Newton Wesley Rowell, another extravagance of this government. He travelled across this country with the Customs Inquiry Commission, and he received in fees in a short time, less than a year, \$44,060. That looks a good sum to the farmers and workmen, many of whom are not drawing down more than \$2 or \$2.25 per day. I notice that the Labour department of this government tells us that the average living wage at the present time should be in the neighbourhood of \$85 per month. I want to tell the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) and the government that there are hundreds of thousands of people in Canada who are subsisting on less than \$60 a month. I could take the Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister into homes and show them workmen who are keeping their families and trying to pay their way, and are getting only \$2 a day.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have followed this debate with a good deal of care and have read a number of speeches delivered during its course that it was not my privilege to hear. I have also read over several times the budget speech and the budget proposals of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), but I am not satisfied that he has proposed any substantial remedy for dealing with the problems confronting Canada to-day. Notwithstanding the fact that we have a somewhat relative prosperity, we have still a good many problems to deal with. On the tariff we have very largely a stand-pat policy, the same policy that we have had ever since the introduction of the National Policy.

It seems to me the government decided that because there was likely to be a good surplus this year it would get them by regardless of what criticism might be levelled at them.

The budget surplus announced by the Minister of Finance is largely the result of world conditions, as well as the good crop or two that we have had in western Canada, and of course some other factors; it is not particularly the result of any government policy as far as I can see. In the course of his budget speech the minister, after reviewing certain conditions, is reported at page 594 of Hansard as follows:

These, we believe, are factors which, coupled with good crops, have materially assisted in the expansion of our basic industries.

I think we ought to lay special emphasis on that word "coupled" in relation to his budget proposals. His "coupled with good crops" argument reminds me of the story of the Irishman who entered a tailor's shop with a button and asked to have a pair of pants sewed on to it. I believe that, looking at the budget surplus, the government are fortifying themselves against any criticism by repeating to themselves that passage of Scripture, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." But, after all, if there is to be any change of tariff policy it should be made in times of surpluses. The other day the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) pointed out that the time to make cuts in the tariff, if they were to be made at all in line with the proclaimed policy of the Liberal party, must be when we had surpluses. I think we had a somewhat similar thought expressed by the Prime Minister in days gone by. I remember when he was in Edmonton in 1924, after reviewing the difficulties he had had as Prime Minister, due to the fact that he was practically leading a minority party in the house, he is reported as stating—and I am quoting this from the Edmonton Bulletin of October 11, 1924:

When asked to form a cabinet he was very diffident concerning the task, as it meant he would have to carry on, not as a government strongly supported, but really as a minority government depending on the support of one of the other parties in the house. Mr. King expressed his appreciation of the loyalty and support accorded to him by the Progressive members of the House of Commons.

That was one difficulty. The other stressed was the difficulty of Dominion finance, due to the fact that the Conservative government which preceded him had been very extravagant and had added tremendously to the national debt. Then we have this passage in the Edmonton Bulletin's report:

When criticizing the present Liberal government, Mr. King asked his audience to bear in mind the difficulties that had to be faced, and he pointed out that if a Liberal government