

get really good men for this commission who will honestly serve this country. I know that as salaries go in the grain trade you cannot possibly get good men at \$6,000 a year. This grain trade is a very highly paid business. You cannot expect to get a really efficient man at \$6,000 a year, as the minister will find out, if he makes inquiry. I should like it to be put on a basis where we could expect to have really efficient men on the commission.

Mr. ROBB: If this item is passed, I think it would be fair to consent to a full discussion of the whole grain trade on the following items.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it the intention of the Government, in view of the allegations or charges made in the last few months in regard to this—

Mr. ROBB: Permit me to finish. This whole item has not yet passed. There are other items in it, and the hon. member can make his point—

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to propound a question. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the grain inquiry which was commenced and suspended for lack of appropriations, in view of the added charges, which, I understand, have recently been filed in affidavit form with the Board of Grain Commissioners at Fort William?

Mr. ROBB: There is an item in the estimates for that purpose, and, when that item is under consideration, the Government will be glad to listen to representations from Parliament.

Mr. STEVENS: If the minister would be prepared to make a definite statement at that time, I would be satisfied. I think the House is entitled to a statement in regard to this matter.

Mr. ROBB: We will make a statement when that question is under consideration.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Friday, June 9th, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the

House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. Sir Henry Drayton.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, my first duty—and it is a pleasure as well—is to offer my grateful acknowledgment of the very many kind words that have been said in the course of this debate concerning myself and my public life in what, I suppose, must be called the evening of my career. It is a pleasure to me to feel that, in a somewhat long political career, through all the storm and strife which seems to be incidental to political discussion, not only have I had the good fortune to have the loyal support of the great party to which I belong, but it has been my great good luck, I count it, that, in almost all these movements, I have had, in a very large degree, the goodwill and friendship of hon. members whose sense of public duty obliges them to differ from me. For all the good words that have been said from all portions of the House, for the loyal support of friends, and the very generous observations of my political opponents, I desire to offer sincere thanks.

Before I proceed to inform the House of the changes which the Government desire to propose in the budget resolutions, I shall ask permission of the House to call attention to some of the criticisms that have been offered. The field is a broad one, and the temptation is strong, but I shall try to resist it, except to deal with a few points. First, let me say that I shall deal with the attitude that has been assumed by my good friends of the Progressive party in relation to this budget. I think we had a right to expect a rather more generous criticism of the budget than has come from them. We expected no help, no aid and no sympathy from my hon. friends of the official Opposition. It is not their business to be pleased with anything we do, naturally. On the trade question there is a broad line of demarcation between the official Opposition and the Government. They boast that they stand for protection. We of the Liberal party have never stood for protection, and we do not stand for it now. In our resolution of the last session, which I had occasion to read at an earlier stage of this debate, we distinctly took issue with them on that ground. They declared for protection. We declared in our resolution that we were not prepared to accept that principle.

Our Progressive friends do us the justice of saying that, as far as we have gone, the budget is all right, but they think it should go much further. Well, from their point of view, it is reasonable, perhaps, that they should think that. But then most of us learn that we cannot in all things have our own way. All political matters are essentially matters of compromise, in some degree, and, so long as the compromise is not one of principle, there is no reason why men should not compromise, because it is only by a policy of that nature that government can ever be carried on. So I say to my friends the Progressive party, that they are not asked to compromise any principle, but if they believe, as most of them have said, that as far as the budget has gone, it is in their direction, then it seems to me they should be willing to accept it, they may say, as a temporary measure; but, whatever view they may want to take of it, it is a step in the right direction, and, for that reason, I think they should give it their support. A year ago the Liberal party voted for a certain resolution. I read it in the House before. May I call attention again to a portion of it, as follows:

That, while recognizing that existing financial requirements of the Dominion demand the maintenance of a Customs Tariff, the House is unable to concur in the declarations by the Government that the tariff should be based on the principle of protection; the tariff is a tax, and the aim of legislation should be to make taxation as light as circumstances will permit;

And further on—

That, while keeping this aim clearly in mind, the House recognizes that in any readjustment of the tariff that may take place, regard must be had to existing conditions of trade, and changes made in such a manner as will cause the least possible disturbance of business.

I want to call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this is not only our own policy, but it was the Progressive policy, because every Progressive in the House did us the honour of voting for it. We had not as large a Progressive group as we have to-day, but the hon. member for Marquette then, as now, was their leader. He did not have a large group, but he had a very energetic group. They found the Liberal policy of that day was entirely in harmony with their own policy, that resolution called for a revision downward, and made in such a manner that business should not be disturbed, and that is exactly what the budget proposes. I say, in all sincerity, that this budget ought to commend itself to our Progressive friends, not as a finality, not as something

that is entirely in line with their own views, but as something which follows the right direction, and, so far as it goes it should have their cordial support. If, instead of having the large group they have to-day, being the second group in this House, they had the good fortune, or the misfortune to be group No. 1 and to be charged with the responsibility of carrying on the government of this country, and if the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) were standing in my place at this moment, I venture to say that he would be obliged, in the light of that resolution, to bring forward a budget substantially in line with that which I have presented. The responsibility is over the whole of us, and I believe if any hon. gentleman of the Progressive party were charged with the responsibility that has come to us to-day, he would feel, if he listened to the representations that have been made, that this was not a time for radical changes, but a time for caution, for moderation, for seeking to take into consideration the interests of the whole country. We are so apt, each of us in our own part of the country, to look at things from a sectional point of view, and that is unavoidable. One of the great things of Parliament is that mind meets mind, from east and west and from north and south; and while we look at things from different angles, we discover, for the first time, many of us, that there is another side to every question. As we meet together and mind rubs against mind, in the contact of mind and mind we discover that we are able to take broader views. I said this in opposition and I say it now that, while I believed the Liberal party would win, I had no fear that the Progressive party would do any great wrong to this country. I believed a sense of sobriety would come to all men placed in a position of responsibility and would lead those men to apply moderately the doctrines to which they had committed themselves. So I say, in all sincerity, if hon. gentlemen opposite were standing in our place to-day, they would be obliged to pursue a policy very much along the line of that which we are trying to follow now. It is a policy of moderation, a policy which conforms entirely to the resolution that I have read.

Very much attention has been called to the fact that although we make small reductions in the tariff, we have increased the sales tax, and emphasis is laid on that fact. The sales tax and the customs tax are two different things. No matter what

