

Ephesians; great are our political Dianas over there in the matter of holding up the price of wheat, not only in Canada but evidently all over the world. If this later stabilization proposition in this budget works out in the same way the minister will wish he had never introduced the proposal as the government is now heartsick of their wheat stunt. However, I will come to that in a moment. I will hurry along with this recital; it is not very pleasant but it is necessary in order to get the setting for the last step in the present budget in this ghastly array of blunders.

The next major blunder I have is the Ottawa economic conference. I think we heard of that in the early part of this session; there was some discussion of the so-called but delusive six per cent preference on wheat and the preferences on butter, apples, and other commodities. Why are these things passed up and disregarded, and excluded from the intended benefits of this stabilization fund? Is it because the government thinks some good has been done by Mr. McFarland, who tried to hold up the market but failed? Is it because they think the preference of six cents has put any lining in our pockets? They have not said so but they must think so or they would not dare pass by such important commodities as lumber, apples and all cereals. That is one reason why I want this matter referred to the agricultural committee. I think this is more important than the piffing milk investigation in which we are now engaged. We are getting a good deal of interesting information but we have no power to act, in my estimation; this is largely if not entirely a municipal matter, and in dealing with it federally we are just meddling in other people's business. So I hope the agricultural committee will try to redeem itself by considering a proposition like the proposed stabilization fund that is worthy of the ability that can be found among its members.

We had a number of other proposals to assist agriculture among them the Serkau proposition, that famous 'cattle deal with Russia. The government tried to put the opposition in the position of being in favour of Mr. Serkau's proposal. Certainly we were in favour of trying to sell cattle or anything else to any country under the sun that would pay proper prices. Of course many of Serkau's proposals were absurd, though I suppose they were made as feelers, just as dickerers often make propositions to feel out the prospective customer. I think the Minister of Agriculture came out at the big end of the horn; so far as he was concerned as he showed that he wanted to make a bargain and trade our

[Mr. Motherwell.]

cattle for Russian oil and other products, and for that he is to be commended. But his lord and master came along from mid ocean on his way home and snuffed out that proposition like a candle, after which the minister had to get into line. Why is it that we cannot deal or barter with Russia? When the Liberal government was in power we were jeered at for selling five or six thousand horses which were running about our prairies eating up good grass, and which had no particular economic value to us. That was a much more difficult time to deal with Russia. Why cannot hon. gentlemen opposite with all their financial ability do the same? So far they have failed to do so when our western and eastern farmers have large herds of cattle, both dairy and beef, ready to be sold. Russia is hungry for these cattle but the government will not permit the two parties to get together to make a bargain. Is it any wonder the government is going down in public estimation? Every day the sun rises and sets this government is going lower in the estimation of a vast body of the people of this country. It has got to such a point that the electors are rearin' to go and get at the ballot boxes. Nothing in the world will save their political necks, not even their confrères in the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation corner to my left.

The estimates also for agriculture, the first industry in Canada, were slaughtered this session in a manner which seemed to give some hon. members opposite a great deal of delight. The preceding government had pulled them up—it took some pulling—to where they totalled ten or eleven million dollars, but down they went with a slam to three and a quarter millions less. Public sentiment was so enraged that the government restored about three quarters of a million, leaving a net loss of two and a half million. This vote has been banged down again this year by another \$400,000 drop. We are told further that \$14,000,000 is going to be cut off all the estimates in order to make the budget not balance next year and doubtless this will mean a further pro rata cut for agriculture.

Having got over that phase, we come now to this precious budget itself. This country has seen a succession of blunders which cannot be paralleled in any other country having responsible government. As I have often pointed out, the Minister of Agriculture has no chance to make good. If he was the angel Gabriel and had all the agricultural knowledge in the world, without more support than he is getting from his colleagues he could not make