gratulations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on having spent about forty years in the service of his country, a fact which any man might well be proud of, and on having been able in that time to present the House and the country with seventeen budgets, an accomplishment also worthy of mention. I said that I wished to convey my sincere congratulations. I do not propose to qualify those congratulations by a wholesale condemnation of the provisions of the budget. We realize, I think, that the minister has had a difficult task imposed upon him. Under present conditions it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to please everyone, and I presume the Minister of Finance himself, old parliamentarian as he is, does not expect that the bouquets that we throw in his direction will be entirely denuded of any thorns that might be attached to the stems. Therefore, while commending many features in connection with the budget, I desire to draw attention to a few things that, I think, are not so commendable.

Amongst the exemptions from the operation of the sales tax, I am pleased to notice one feature. I had occasion to make some requests for the exemption of the sales tax as applied to drain tile for farm drainage purposes. I can imagine that it is very difficult in applying the sales tax, where it is necessary to raise revenue, to single out a few articles that should be exempted. In a few words, I should like to point out why, in my judgment, this particular article should be exempted from the operation of the sales tax. It is well known that the condition of agriculture at the present time is such that some encouragment is needed. It has been recognized for some time that much can be done to increase production, and at the same time to increase profits, by the practice of underdraining. The provincial governments recognizing this, have in most cases provided, through the municipalities, an arrangement whereby farmers can secure loans for the establishment of under-drainage. This encouragement is provided by a long-term loan repayable in instalments at a low rate of interest. For the federal government to apply a sales tax to the very same article which the provincial government is, in effect, giving a bounty or assistance to, does not appear to be a sound principle. Therefore, in discussing this matter with the Minister of Finance I represented that to be my view, and in addition, I suppose, other similar representations have been made. I am glaid to note that in the interest of the farmers, this item has been included in the exemptions.

There are also some further changes, particularly with regard to the stamp tax. I cannot see that the stamp tax as applied last session, or as changed as it has been this session, is a fair one for the poor man. It is more a tax in the interest of the rich than in the interest of the poor, and I will endeavour to show why. Under the present condition of many business men and particularly the farmers, it is necessary, in order that they may tide themselves over the present financial depression, for them to secure loans from banks or other sources. A stamp to the extent of two cents for every fifty dollars must be placed on the note by which such a loan is secured. Therefore, when a farmer has to borrow $2,000 from a bank in order to tide him over a financial difficulty, he is taxed because of his misfortune, on the loan, and then because in the operation of sound business principles, that money has again to be paid out by cheque, he is taxed to the same extent over again on the cheque. Therefore, because his cheques are not of sufficient size to obtain any benefit from the minimum tax of $1, he is doubly taxed on the transaction. In comparison with the man who has means of his own or who deals in money in large volume, he is very unjustly taxed under the present system. In my opinion, the minister would have been well advised to have made that tax on both notes and cheques, not to exceed two cents for each $100 instead of two cents for each $50.

The minister in the presentation of his budget referred to the fact that he did not expect to be able to please his friends of low tariff persuasion by going to the extent that they would wish; neither did he expect to please the official opposition by making protection as high as they would wish. I should like to challenge that statement in particular, because I wish to point out that with very few exemptions he is adopting the tariff that was in force by this party that he styles a high tariff party. But, Sir, he has gone a little further than that and has even attempted to out-Herod Herod by adding a stability clause which the Conservative party never saw fit to propose. We in this corner of the House have openly professed our faith in a protective tariff, not because we wish to protect any particular industry, but because we believe it is better to use the proper name and call a spade a spade. I was very much impressed with the clear definition of the terms, "protective tariff" and "tariff for revenue" as given by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). In our platform we ask only for