

Coming to the question of how I shall vote on the Budget, the first thing I wish to consider is what result will occur if we turn the Government out, as regards, first, the general condition of the country and, second, what Government would take its place, because I mean to vote on this Budget (although people may say: Your vote will make little difference) just as if my vote was to turn the Government out. I would simply say that just at the present time in this country we are confronted by very serious conditions. I certainly do not take the pessimistic view that some people do who think that we are all to be swallowed up by a black revolution. I have an infinite faith in the calm good sense of our Canadian people, and therefore, I do not think we are going to have a revolution. At the same time, no one will deny that we are at this moment confronted with an anxious situation, because we must admit that in some parts of the country the leadership of labour has passed from the hands of our good, sane, sensible, solid labour men into the hands of men whose ideals are foreign to us, foreign to our Government, foreign to our institutions and foreign to those ideals which you and I, Sir, and all of us learned at our mothers' bosoms and our fathers' knees. On that ground, therefore, I do not think I can take the responsibility of voting this Government out of power and bringing on a general election at this time. If the present Government were defeated, the Prime Minister would have to advise the Crown to call upon the leader of the Opposition to form a Government, and an election would ensue. I do not imagine the leader of the Opposition is very anxious just now to assume the reins of Government, and some of his followers have, I understand, expressed themselves to that effect. I cannot help remembering at this time the speech of the leader of the Opposition of May 9. When I came back from the West I read this speech, and I thought at first I was reading a speech of some very high protectionist or some article in some high protectionist newspaper.

The Liberal party are to hold a national convention on the 8th of August. The light, I believe, is still in the window; at least, we have had no formal notification of its having been removed except in the case of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), I understand that if he ever drags his weary and prodigal footsteps back to that "light in the window," the hon. mem-

ber for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) means to pull down the blind. We shall all watch that convention with the greatest possible interest, and we shall examine very closely the platform that is going to be brought down. I want, in the most friendly possible manner, to tell the leader of the Opposition and the gentlemen sitting behind him who will have a great deal to do with formulating the policy on which they will appeal to the electorate at the next election, that if they wish to attract the Liberal thought of this country, if they wish to appeal to the men in this country who want better things, if they want to catch the rising tide of democracy on the flood, they will have to present a better programme than has been foreshadowed in the speeches of the leader of the Opposition and his supporters during this session.

Therefore I say that in view of the situation in this country, in view of the Government we might expect to obtain in place of the present one, and in view of what we might obtain from that Government in the way of free trade, I am not prepared to take the responsibility at the present time of voting the Government out. After all, I think this is a Budget of expediency, but this being a time of expediency, I think it more expedient to vote for the Budget than to vote against it.

In conclusion, let me say just this: I stand for an increase in the income tax, for an inheritance tax, and above all for a tax on the unimproved value of land. I stand for greater and better and grander things than anything contained in proposals of the Budget, or that is camouflaged in the amendment of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before putting the question, I wish to say that when the amendment of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was submitted I reserved judgment as to its validity, because, at first view, it bore resemblance to one presented by the hon. member at an earlier stage of the present session. A careful examination, however, discloses that while a portion contains some matter substantially the same as contained in the amendment previously referred to, there is a portion entirely new, and a large part of the former amendment has been omitted. This being the case, the present amendment may properly be regarded as new within the meaning of the Rules. In coming to this conclusion I am supported by decisions heretofore given in this House, which also would appear to be in conformity with the practice in the British House of Commons.