

gument the hon. member took away from the context one or two lines or sentences, and formed judgment upon that dislocated statement. That argument is not worth anything, and consequently the foundation upon which it was based is too superficial to warrant attention. I would ask the House to remember the statement of Thomas Carlyle, when considering public men. In his *Life of Burns* appears this statement:

The world often, yea too often, is unjust in its judgment of men—"It decides like a court of law, by dead statutes; and not positively but negatively, less on what is done right, than on what is or is not done wrong. Not the few inches of deflection from the mathematical orbit which are so easily measured but the ratio of these to the whole diameter constitutes the real aberration". . . .

Instead of measuring a public man by a few lines in a superficial way, the hon. member for North Oxford should take the whole statement made by the hon. member for Regina in order to arrive at a conclusion. The Minister of Railways, who now represents the constituency of Regina, is well known in Saskatchewan; he rose from a poor British immigrant to the position which he holds to-day. He was first secretary of a grain growers' local; from there he went to the vice presidency of the provincial grain growers' organization and then to the general managership of the largest grain-handling concern in the world, the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator system. From that position he was called to the office of treasurer of Saskatchewan, and from there to the position of premier of that province. A man who can make such progress in his own adopted province certainly has a message and an influence for Canada at large, and I believe that as the hon. member for Regina continues in his present position he will give not only direction, but support and co-operation as well, to the railway systems of the country and that support and co-operation will be reflected favourably throughout the whole country in the near future.

We have had another acquisition to the strength of this government in the person of the new Minister of Health, Minister of Labour and Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment (Mr. Elliott). I think I am right in saying that if he continues the success already attained he will go far. The hon. member has won success in his legal profession, and also as a member of the provincial legislature; he will be a source of strength to the government of which he is now a member and will give to the department—

[Mr. McIntosh.]

ments under his control not only the best leadership but the best ideals as well.

Then we come to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), who has brought down the present budget. This budget takes one back to some of the other ministers of finance of Canada. The first finance minister was Hon. A. T. Galt, who was noted for one outstanding qualification. When a new tariff was brought into existence in 1858 and 1859, before confederation, the Colonial Secretary of the day said the tariff could not be accepted. Mr. Galt said, "That is the tariff made by the legislatures of Upper and Lower Canada; that is where we stand on fiscal matters, and on questions of taxation and tariff." So Mr. Galt stood his ground, with the result that Canada won what might be termed fiscal independence, and from that day to this the Minister of Finance, in co-operation with the cabinet and those in this House supporting that cabinet, has taken the responsibility of bringing in a budget from year to year, deciding on questions of tariff and taxation.

After Hon. Mr. Galt came Hon. Mr. Tilley, and perhaps the outstanding point about Mr. Tilley was that although he supported the national policy, he considered that if it could not show a favourable balance of trade from year to year it would not be successful. We find him taking that stand continually, but although he took that stand his contention did not work out, because from 1878 to 1896, during a period of eighteen years, in only one year was there a balance of trade in favour of Canada. That was in 1880, when the favourable trade balance amounted to about \$1,500,000, but in that year the national debt was increased by roughly \$9,000,000.

Following Hon. Mr. Tilley came Hon. Sir George E. Foster, and he also took the stand that from year to year there should be amendments to the tariff, proving conclusively that even under the National Policy it was impossible to have what we might call an exact tariff; it had to move up or down in accordance with the conditions of business in the country. Those who stand for a high protective policy to-day should listen to the pronouncements made by Sir George Foster in 1894. He said:

If there is to be a protective system at all, everybody knows that it must be higher in its inception than as the years gradually pass, when industries have become established and when the industrial development of the country grows apace.

Again he said:

The time for revision has come, the time for a complete examination of the whole matter of our tariff arrangements in order that the anomalies exist-