

out that the British preference has been destroyed, in view of the fact that the British preference as a whole is as great to-day as it was before this Budget was brought down, and in some things it is greater. The tariff has not touched mowers, or reapers, or binders, or binder twine, and all these things are just in the same position as they were. And yet we have the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and other hon. members waxing eloquent over the manner in which the farmers of this country are being taxed.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Would the hon. gentleman mind telling us how many reapers and binders and mowers were imported from Great Britain?

Mr. BRADBURY: Reapers and binders are not imported from Great Britain, but the duty of 7½ per cent that is applied to all other items is not applied to these items. The Government of this country did not place an extra duty on these implements.

Mr. CARVELL: Ask him about ploughs.

Mr. BRADBURY: I will tell my hon. friend something about ploughs before I finish. We had in this House a few years ago the Minister of Finance of the late Government, a very eminent man, a man who was looked upon by the Liberal party, and indeed by Conservatives, as one of the big men of Canada; I refer to the Hon. Mr. Fielding. Let us see what position the Hon. Mr. Fielding now takes with regard to this Budget, and let us compare it with the position taken by his Liberal friends in this House. If Mr. Fielding were in the House now, sitting beside his old leader, I venture to say the criticisms that have been offered to this Budget never would have emanated from the Liberal party. I quote from the Journal of Commerce, of which the Hon. Mr. Fielding is editor, and in its issue of Friday, February 12, 1915, dealing with the Budget, it says:

Increased taxation is not at any time welcome, and therefore Mr. White's budget is not likely to be regarded as a thing of joy. But taxes which at another period might evoke sharp criticism may be accepted under present conditions with something like equanimity.

While expenditure had increased, the revenues were no longer flourishing. The war, no doubt, added to the diminution of income. But even if there had been no war, additional taxation would have been inevitable. Whether the money was required for one purpose or another, the situation to the Finance Minister was the same. He had to raise more revenue.

I commend this to hon. gentlemen opposite.

If there are any who are disposed to criticise his method they would do well to reflect whether

any better and more convenient way could have been taken. The exemptions that have been made show the minister had a commendable desire to avoid, as far as he could, the placing of additional burdens on those least able to bear them. Some of the minor taxes may prove more irritating than profitable, but they are not unjust. The addition of five per cent to the tariff on British goods, and seven and one half per cent on other goods, is the main feature of the Budget. If the question were one of permanent fiscal policy, these additions would, of course, be open to grave objection. But they are imposed to meet what we all hope is a temporary condition, and if those who for the moment may profit by them distinctly understand this, and govern themselves accordingly, there will probably be little objection to this portion of the Budget.

Altogether, Mr. White seems to have made the best of a troublesome situation.

This is the opinion of the late Liberal Minister of Finance in reference to the Budget, and he was once looked upon by his own party as one of the greatest men in Canada; in my opinion he was the greatest finance minister the Liberal party ever had. These are his opinions; this is his advice to his party, and, comparing Mr. Fielding's remarks with the remarks of the hon. gentlemen opposite who are making this carping criticism on the Budget, the comparison places them in a very awkward position before the people of Canada. We had the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), a few nights ago in this House, in his wild heroics, raising his hand to Heaven and declaring: keep your unboly and disloyal hands off the British preference. Just imagine the hon. gentleman waxing eloquent over this matter, and this in the face of the advice of the great Finance Minister of his own party, which warns him to be careful in his language, and points out to him that there was no better way to deal with the situation than that in which the present Finance Minister has dealt with it. But, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) does not deceive any one; it does not deceive the electors in the West and it does not deceive the members in this House. So much for the British preference. Some hon. gentleman a few moments ago spoke of ploughs, and the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) and the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) have both referred in this debate to the increased duty on ploughs. The hon. member for Medicine Hat said:

I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press of Tuesday, February 23—

The Free Press is a very dangerous authority to quote on a question of this kind.