

path. He pointed out, in very different terms from those used by the Acting Prime Minister, that this amendment was only political jobbery and humbug, and did not mean anything, being only brought in for political effect. Now, to show what trouble a bad memory may cause, I shall read an amendment moved by the Hon. Frank Oliver to the motion for Supply, on May 29, 1917, which I think is as close a parallel to the amendment moved this afternoon as could be found. Hon. Frank Oliver (Edmonton) moved in amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

In the opinion of this House it would be in the public interest if the Customs Tariff Act were so amended as to provide:

1. That wheat, wheat flour, and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list.
2. That farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery, and repairs for same, rough and partly dressed lumber, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers be added to the free list.
3. That staple foods and food products (other than wheat flour), domestic animals and foods therefor, be admitted into Canada free of duty when coming from and being the product of, any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty.
4. That substantial reductions be made in the general tariff on all articles imported into Canada, excepting luxuries.
5. That the British Preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff.

I do not think two amendments more similar in language and meaning could be moved, than the one I have just read and that moved this afternoon. The amendment of Hon. Frank Oliver was voted on, and I want to call attention to what happened. We were told this afternoon that it was in bad taste, very unfortunate, and none too patriotic to move such an amendment now that the soldiers were being brought back, but the amendment of Hon. Frank Oliver was moved in 1917 when the war was at a most critical stage, and among the 'Yeas' who voted for the amendment I find the names of Buchanan and Clark (Red Deer).

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Was that after or before the Budget?

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alta.): It was before, but whether it was before or after, the war was on, and my hon. friend voted for the amendment which was so similar to the one moved this afternoon. My hon. friend should not scold us just because we cannot follow him across the floor. Perhaps we learnt our lesson too well when he was our teacher.

[Mr. W. H. White.]

He also told us that the Opposition had no responsibilities I might tell him that if we were as erratic as he has proved to be, we might never be in the Opposition; we would be supporting the Government. There is a way of keeping out of the Opposition, and there are other reasons for an hon. member being on the other side. I have heard of a man who represented a district as a party man and received the party endorsement for some years; and when that endorsement was refused him, he changed sides and ran as candidate for the opposite party. That is another way of staying in the Government. After all, we can say that we have the support of all organized farmers in the province from which he and I come. We have the support of both sides, Conservatives and Liberals, in our legislature; and if we are guilty of playing politics all those people in the province of Alberta are guilty of the same offence. I suggest to my hon. friend, who is so well versed in the principles of Liberalism, which he probably learned in a better school than we did, and had perhaps a more sincere teacher than many of us who learned the free-trade doctrine in this country, that he should be more tolerant, if we are not able to see eye to eye with him. My hon. friend admitted the other day that all the preaching and all the beautiful speeches that had been made in this House had been without avail. He said that the most promising pupil of all was the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). But I do not think there is much to show for twelve years of labour. I do not notice any tendency in that direction. If the hon. minister has views of the kind indicated, he has kept them very well concealed. We hope the statement is true, however; and hon. gentlemen on this side will be only too glad to support a resolution of this kind, whether introduced by the Acting Prime Minister or by the hon. member for Red Deer.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House very long in any contribution I have to make this evening to the discussion on the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). The subject matter of the resolution is particularly interesting at this juncture of the session and at this time in the life of the nation. I shall be quite frank with the House, as to where I personally stand in this matter. My record in regard to the fiscal policy of Canada is well known at any rate in that part of the country which I have the honour to represent and in