

friend has said there has been no change of public opinion. I want for a moment to draw his attention to this. I am told there are members sitting in this House to-day who voted against reciprocity in 1911 and who are to-day subscribing to the resolution of the Progressives which is in favour of reciprocity. I do not say that of my own knowledge, but I am so informed. Last week in the town of Yarmouth a large meeting was held of the fishing interests of the south shore of Nova Scotia and was attended by leading gentlemen from three or four counties. Among these gentlemen were many from my own constituency, including a number of prominent citizens who opposed and helped to defeat me in 1911. Those gentlemen at that meeting declared that what the interests of Nova Scotia most need to-day is the admission of its products into the United States market. Yet my hon. friend says there is no change in public opinion. There is a change in this way, that the time is come when the people will no longer view this question through the spectacle of partisanship; they are looking at it, as it ought to have been looked at from the beginning, as an economic question. The cattle raisers of the West and the fishermen of the East alike feel that admission of their products to the United States market would be one of the greatest things for the commercial success of Canada. That is the feeling in Canada to-day. It is said of the Bourbons that they learned nothing and forgot nothing. I doubt whether the Conservative party of Canada are going to endorse the position taken by my right hon. friend against reciprocity. An economic question will override a purely political question, and although my right hon. friend may still desire to take the Bourbonic view of the matter, I believe there are thousands of Conservatives in Canada who will readily follow us if we go to the polls on that issue and who will stand for reciprocity now, though they did not stand for it in 1911.

Now, about the budget. I have said that it is a very modest budget, an unassuming budget. There are no fireworks about it. It does not offer a great deal; it offers just a simple statement of what seems to be most needed to meet the conditions of the day. First, it offers exemption from those new taxes that my right hon. friend would impose to balance the budget. We do not want to balance the budget with new taxes to-day; we will wait and see, if I may quote that expression again, and hope that we shall be able to balance it next year without new taxes. Then, we offer a wide, comprehensive

[Mr. Fielding.]

measure of tariff reduction. We offer a substantial increase in the British preference. We offer a reduction aggregating \$2,500,000 on one household article, sugar—and if you want to do something to relieve the masses of the people in respect to the commodities that they use, what article could be better chosen than sugar? And we make a proposal—I am glad to find that it was honoured by some hon. gentlemen on the other side—to encourage the business of the Canadian ports. Reduced taxation, then; reduced duty on sugar; increased British preference; tariff improvements; simplification of the sales tax—in all these things, simple, unpretentious as they are, you have the elements of a sound, sensible budget, one which, I am bound to say, will receive and has already received approval from the people of Canada.

I know you can have no budget that will please everybody. I know you cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs. I know that any time you touch the tariff somebody will for the moment think he is hurt. But in all my experience in making budgets I never knew a budget that was characterized by so many evidences of the public favour as have been indicated in the communications which have come to me, as well as by what has appeared in the press. I present this budget to-day as a simple, businesslike transaction, a project of common sense to meet the present situation, and I am sure that it will receive the favourable judgment of the Canadian people.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Forke, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,	Hopkins,
Beaubien,	Hudson,
Bird,	Irvine,
Black (Huron),	Jelliff,
Brethen,	Johnston,
Brown,	Kellner,
Caldwell,	Kennedy (Edmonton),
Campbell,	Kennedy (Glengarry &
Carmichael,	Stormont),
Coote,	Kennedy (Port Arthur &
Davies,	Kenora),
Drummond,	King (Huron),
Elliott (Dundas),	Knox,
Elliott (Waterloo),	Leader,
Evans,	Lewis,
Fansher,	Lovie,
Findlay,	Lucas,
Forke,	Macphail,
Gardiner,	McConica,
Garland (Bow River),	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Good,	McMaster,
Gould,	McTaggart,
Halbert,	Millar,
Hoey,	Milne,