

Mr. ADSHEAD: He might sit on the neutral benches and say exactly what his conscience told him to say. At any rate, he seemed to blame the present government for the poverty and unemployment which exist in the city of Toronto. I may say that as far back as 1913—and I am not blaming the government—in the city of Calgary I was in a parade in which a large number of unemployed walked through the streets waving banners on which were printed the words, "Shall we work, starve or steal?" At that time a Conservative government was in power and they repudiated any responsibility for unemployment. When the tide turned and the Liberals came into power, unemployment once more stalked through the land and made its appearance in the city of Calgary, and this government also repudiated any responsibility for that unemployment. I have letters on file from Hon. James Murdock, then Minister of Labour, in which it was distinctly stated that unemployment was not a federal but a local responsibility, and that although the government proposed to extend a certain amount of assistance it was only to be of a temporary nature, since unemployment was not the business of the federal government at all. So we see that all governments, whether Liberal or Conservative, repudiate any responsibility for unemployment, and the hon. member for West Hamilton had no right to chastise or blame this government for unemployment in the city of Toronto.

In considering the budget I must say that it seems a rather innocuous affair; it does not seem to have very much in it about which we can talk. However, I think we should congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) on the fact that he has a surplus. We are glad he has not reduced the income tax, but we are sorry to see that the reductions made in the tariff are certainly in favour of the manufacturer. It is a colourless, stand-pat sort of budget. No doubt the Minister of Finance had in mind the public opinion which has been expressed as to what the United States might do with their tariff, and I think possibly he was justified in marking time and in presenting a sort of stand-pat budget which is colourless and innocuous. There is very little in the budget to vote for; however, there is nothing in it which I consider it necessary to vote against, so that I do not see anything else to do but vote for it.

The Minister of Finance might well consider the suggestion of the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Fansher) in connection with the harvesting machines, the swather and the combine, which are purely harvesting

machines. I attended a banquet at the city of Toronto not long ago at which Hon. Mr. Euler and Hon. Mr. Stewart were present. A gentleman sat beside me and during the evening he related his experience with the swather and combine. He had two sections of land and when the snow came in the fall of 1928 he told me that had he not had the swather he would have lost his entire crop. He used that machine as a harvesting machine, and he was able to thresh his grain in the spring, and get No. 2 grading. The evolution of farm machinery shows that that is a true harvesting machine. We first had the sickle, and after that there came what was called the grapevine cradle. After the cradle there came a reaper, and after the reaper came the binder. We had some difficulties at first with the wire binder, but finally that was adjusted through the utilization of binder twine. We have gone one step farther and now we have the swather and the combine succeeding the binder in the mechanical evolution of farm implements. I would make a strong and earnest plea to the minister to support the contentions of the hon. member for Last Mountain, that he place these machines where they belong in the tariff rating, thus enabling them to come into the country under a six per cent rather than a ten per cent duty.

During this debate we have heard considerable about the favourable balance of trade. If our exports are greater than our imports we hear it said that the country is prospering; if our imports are greater than our exports then it is said we are not prosperous. I consider that an entirely erroneous idea. There is no real difference between imports and exports, because imports are accounted for, either by exports or in some other way.

The acting leader of the opposition has said that we in our corner never talk politics, but I think we should talk politics if politics is the business of the country. The word "politician" is looked upon as not being a very creditable term when applied to any man, while the word "statesman" is considered in the opposite light. I have been told that a statesman is a man who desires to do something for his country, while a politician is a man who would like his country to do something for him. The fact that our exports are greater than our imports seems to be taken by the minister as evidence of the country's prosperity, and when the imports exceed the exports then my friends on my left consider that business is being depressed. One of the greatest exporting nations of recent years has been Germany. She exported her coal from