

to pay a higher rate of interest and not to continue the system of tax exemption.

I discussed the tariff generally at an earlier stage of the session, and there is less reason why I should dwell upon it now, but I cannot help giving expression to this thought. Nearly all the arguments that have been advanced in support of the tariff changes are really arguments why there should be no change at all. Many hon. members have said that this is not the time to make tariff changes. The Minister of Finance himself spoke of the great desirability of tariff stability, and then he proceeded to upset the tariff.

And whispering "I will ne'er consent,"—consented.

All through the discussion we have found the argument used that the time has not arrived for tariff changes. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) dwelt upon that very strongly. He said that he did not see why there was any need of change at all. I do not say that I subscribe to that view; from my point of view, that would not be the wisest course, but from the point of view of hon. gentlemen opposite, they could have logically taken the ground that this was not the time for tariff changes; that the Government has no mandate. But while many of them argued that this is not the time for tariff changes, they proceeded to make tariff changes and not inconsiderable ones either. A reduction of 5 per cent on British goods is not a very inconsiderable change. Older men will recollect, and those who have read the political history of Canada when they were younger, will remember, that a great political party went out of power in 1878 on the question of a duty of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The duties of that day were  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, and the manufacturers interested asked Mr. Alexander Mackenzie to make them 20 per cent. He said he would not do it and they put him out of power. A change of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in the tariff is, therefore, not inconsiderable. Accordingly, the reduction in the duty of 5 per cent, and in some instances of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, is not an inconsiderable item. It is a very important change, and all I care to say now is that while I am not objecting to the changes that are being made, I regret that the arguments which most of the hon. gentlemen have used have been of the same character; they have given us good reasons for no change being made, but they are all going to vote for the changes all the same. I regret I did not have the pleasure this afternoon of hearing the Min-

[Mr. Fielding.]

ister of Finance speak. Had I been aware that he was going to address the House, I would have endeavoured to be present, although I had an important engagement elsewhere. I have, however, had the pleasure of reading what my hon. friend said and it is very interesting.

A very interesting feature of this Budget is the various reasons given in support of it. I have already mentioned the reasons given in favour of doing nothing in support of a Budget which professes to do a good deal. But one of the most interesting reasons that I have heard given for the support of this Budget is that it is a reciprocity Budget. That is something which interests me very much, and if I might say so, without being offensive, it amuses me a little bit. To understand fully the humour of the situation we must go back to the year 1911. Prior to that time my good friend the Finance Minister of to-day (Sir Thomas White) was a Liberal in full communion, I believe, with what he and I would then call the grand old Liberal party. Prior to 1911, when things were said against that party, he gave them no sympathetic hearing. When a foolish man said that the Liberal party had not lived up to their promises the Finance Minister of to-day never allowed any nonsense of that sort to affect him in the least. When accusations of mismanagement and corruption were made against the Liberal party the Finance Minister of to-day paid no attention to them. When the Prime Minister of to-day in an election campaign said that the mere fact that the Liberal Government was spending \$70,000,000 or \$80,000,000 was conclusive evidence of corruption—I wonder what he would say about the \$600,000,000 that is being spent to-day, the Minister of Finance of to-day did not share that view. He knew better. When the various public works of that time were constructed and all sorts of accusations of wrong-doing were made in that connection, the Finance Minister of to-day paid no attention to such cries. He stood true blue. And when that awful crime was committed of undertaking to construct the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we sometimes hear of that awful crime to-day, in spite of all that was said and done against that project the Minister of Finance of to-day was perfectly content; he had no fault to find. So you see he stood faithful down to a certain point, but the worm will turn, the line must be drawn somewhere and my hon. friend found the moment when he could no longer stand for the wickedness which was then present. What