

expenditure, in connection with the ferry to Prince Edward Island, of nearly two million. We have been called upon to make provision for the Hudson Bay railway of five and a half million. In connection with the Transcontinental Railway we have to provide five millions for expenditures to be made at once. On the Quebec bridge an expenditure of three and a half million is provided for in connection with the Welland ship canal, five and one-half million in connection with the Trent canal, one and a half million, and nearly ten million—or to be accurate nine and a half million—chargeable to rivers and harbours, this amount being chiefly for dry-docks. The policy of building dry-docks at our great national ports is one that has been sanctioned by both parties in Canada, and provision has been made to meet expenditure in that particular direction forthwith. Consequently in those few items which I have pointed out we find appropriations approximating \$43,000,000. My hon. friend went back, I think, to 1896. The appropriations which I have mentioned in connection with those few items would represent a greater expenditure than Canada made in 1896 in its entirety. Hon. gentlemen will therefore have to remember, to use the expression of a well known Liberal statesman, that we live in a growing time, and consequently the expenditures are relatively great. I have pointed this out, not apologetically, but simply by way of explaining the increasing demands that are made upon the exchequer of Canada from time to time, and for which, to maintain our national progress, we have to provide.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—There is one question to which I should like to direct the attention of this Chamber, which interests vitally the present condition of the country, and which has a considerable effect upon the development and prosperity of Canada. It is the immigration policy of the present Government, which, in my opinion, deserves serious criticism. We have not received during the last few months, any considerable immigration from Europe, and I suppose it will take some time before the proportion of settlers which we used to receive will begin to knock at our doors. The present Government, after the election of 1911, seemed to take for granted that having carried the day on the cry that trade between north and south was undesirable, immigration from the south to the north should be discouraged as well, and all the efforts that had been made for years past to get proper immigration from

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

the Western States have been abandoned. These efforts made by the late Government to get that class of immigrants had been quite successful, and thousands and thousands of the best class of immigrants reached the Northwest through the Canadian-United States western boundary.

Now, there has been considerable of a reduction in the immigration from that area, due to the fact that the Government has recalled a number of agents and has closed a number of agencies throughout the United States. As a result, immigration from those parts of the country has considerably diminished. It seems to me that the Government should revise its policy, and resume that one which was so advantageous to the Northwest. I am quite sure that the representatives here from the West will bear me out when I say that immigration from the neighbouring country was of as high a standard as any that came from Europe and that it is greatly to be regretted that that policy was discontinued.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—In what way has it been stopped?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—It has been stopped by the recall of a number of immigration agents which the late Government had throughout the United States, and more especially throughout the western States; and the result of the recall of those agents has been quite apparent in a marked diminution of immigrants from the United States. It seems to me that if the policy which prevailed before 1911 had been continued, the Northwest could to-day produce, by the increased number of immigrants, a larger area of good crops to the very great advantage of this country.

Hon. Mr. ROCHE—Since I have come into this House I have been informed by those who are well-qualified to expound our functions and duties, that it is not the right and privilege of this House to question any of the items in a Budget which is presented, but that the House must either accept or reject the financial grants given to the King. Therefore, any discussion of items is not practical, but merely advisory; that is, we cannot bring the argument to a test vote for the reduction of any special item. The whole must be accepted or the whole must go. The leader of the Government in this House presented a summary of the many details of the Budget, and grouped together a number of questions which might or might not have had some resemblance to one an-