

higher ocean freights may be expected to absorb, if not more than absorb, any possible saving in rail rates, we cannot believe that this route will ever secure any serious share in the export trade. Still less can we think that it will handle an important business. Unless considerable mineral wealth should be discovered in the territory which this line will open up, it must, we fear, continue to be almost indefinitely a burden upon the people of Canada. And everything that can be done should be done to make this burden as small as possible.

At the end of their recommendations, I find the following words:

We recommend that future expenditures on the Hudson Bay Railway be reduced to the lowest possible amount.

I am surprised to find in the Estimates such a large item as \$3,000,000 for the railway terminals and elevator at Hudson bay. I know the answer of the Minister of Finance will be that the railway was started under the regime which preceded his, but that is not an answer; it is a poor excuse. We must not forget that we are at war, and that the bulk of the expenditures are voted, or should be voted, for war purposes. When I see such a large item as \$3,000,000 for an enterprise which is looked upon by the royal commission appointed by the Government as a burden on which but a minimum should be expended, I consider the Government is reckless and should not be given an opportunity of spending the money in this way, when it is so much needed elsewhere. When war was declared, the right hon. leader of the Opposition uttered some words of wisdom which should have been of benefit to the Government. Speaking in the House of Commons, he said:

I submit with all deference to the judgment of the free people that economy and retrenchment, not more taxation and more expenditure, is the proper policy under present conditions.

One has only to look at the bulky Estimates which have been laid on the table of the House session after session to come to the conclusion that the Government is absolutely money-blind, so far as concerns the question of expenditure. The words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he sat in Opposition, are still ringing in our ears. In those days, when Mr. Fielding, our very able Minister of Finance under the Laurier Government, would come with Supplementary Estimates ranging from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000; there was a storm of protest from the Opposition benches, led by my hon. friend (Sir George Foster). This year, when we have been bled white by all kinds of taxation measures

in order to meet the war contingencies, the Government comes first with Estimates far above those which have been heretofore presented to the House, and then, during the last days of the session, they come with Supplementary Estimates of more than \$50,000,000. I say it is scandalous conduct on the part of the Minister of Finance; he has no regard for the taxpayers of this country.

I know one thing: if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) had his own will, had his own say, in this matter he would cut out this \$3,000,000 for the Hudson Bay railway and this other item of \$3,000,000 for the Quebec and Saguenay railway. We know the hon. gentleman. We all admit, Mr. Speaker, that he has given a fair administration of the Intercolonial railway to the people of Canada. He has been able to resist his own friends on the other side of the House in their attempts to raid the treasury. But, Sir, the Minister of Finance has been dabbling in millions and millions. He belongs to the Toronto school, the school of Sir Byron Walker, of Sir Joseph Flavelle, and others. They are accustomed to dabble in millions and millions, and while my hon. friend has transferred his activities to the Dominion, he continues their methods. He is money blind. He does not seem to know the value of money. Hundreds of millions of dollars are to him what a few dollars are to humble mortals like you, Mr. Speaker, and myself. Let us remember the words of his leader, who was then in opposition. In 1911, when the hon. gentleman joined the merry-go-round of the Tory party, his leader, speaking in Toronto, used the following words:

The increase in what is known as ordinary controllable expenditure of from \$36,000,000 in 1896 to \$79,000,000 in 1910 is proof of extravagance beyond any possible defence and establishes a prima facie case of corruption.

This was published in the manifesto of the leader of the Opposition in 1911. The increase referred to by the then leader of the Opposition was at the rate of \$4,000,000 a year. What, then, is there to be said of an increase of from \$98,000,000, in 1911-12, to \$135,000,000 in 1914-15, or at the rate of over \$12,000,000 a year? If there was corruption with an increase in expenditure of \$4,000,000 a year, surely there is extra corruption in an expenditure which has increased at the rate of \$12,000,000 a year. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who was very vitriolic in his denunciations of the Liberal