

it is used. If it be not specially mentioned, it may fall into the unenumerated list which would bear the rate of 17½ per cent. My hon. friend opposite emphasizes the opinion that silk is a luxury. We think that artificial silk might properly be treated as silk, and put in the tariff accordingly, and if the rate is a high one, it is simply because of the general principles that luxuries are taxed more highly than cheaper commodities. That is the whole story. From a purely revenue point of view, it is a serious thing, because if we displace silk by artificial silk we will be losing the revenue. In this case, I hope we shall get the revenue, and if incidentally it helps to encourage the industry, so much the better. It is a fair illustration of a revenue tariff which carries with it incidental protection.

I have a number of notes to which I intended to refer, but I am frank enough to say, Mr. Speaker, that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister covered the ground so well to-day that I am going to make my speech briefer than it would otherwise have been. In connection, however, with the general criticism, we have heard very much about economy. They all talk about economy. It is the easiest thing to advocate and the hardest thing to accomplish. My hon. friends opposite generally talk about economy. I think possibly my hon. friends of the Progressive group talk of it still more. But if we examine the records of parliament we find that in three cases out of four the suggestions of hon. members opposite do not call for economy, but for larger expenditures of public money. We propose some appropriations for the Militia service, but hon. members opposite say our estimates are too low, and we ought to spend more. I think they find fault and say that we did not grant enough money for the militia. I do not want to debate the merits of it. I simply state it as a fact. We had a similar experience in the matter of naval service. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia brought down some appropriation for the naval service and again we were told we should have provided more money. We are proposing to add one or two industries to the bounty list, and hon. members opposite say the bounties are not large enough, and that we should make them higher. Everybody talks of economy. We all become advocates of economy for the other fellow, not for our own district, not for our own province. My hon. friends from Toronto talk about economy; but they are not anxious to cut down the appropriation for Toronto harbour. The hon. members residing in Toronto, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Harris) emphasized the fact that we

[Mr. Fielding.]

were not spending money as we ought for the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals. This I suppose, would probably take only a couple of hundred million dollars! What about that? They talk economy, and yet they tell us that we should expend money on deepening the St. Lawrence canals. The last speech delivered to-night, namely that by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans), advocated economy; but the only economy he proposed was that we should increase our expenditures by paying more money to the rural mail carriers.

Mr. EVANS: I should like to put the hon. gentleman right. I contrasted their remuneration with that of other members of the Civil Service.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman, I understood, said that they were not getting enough, and he thought they ought to get more. If I am wrong in my understanding, I take it back. He thought these men were not well enough paid and perhaps they are not. I am not debating that question, but it is costing the country six and a quarter million dollars to provide for that service, and if you vote only a moderate increase, you add a couple of million dollars to the expenditure. I am not discussing the merits of the case; I am simply pointing out that this cry for economy contrasts very strangely with the attitude of hon. gentlemen when they come to deal with matters in which they have a keen interest.

My Progressive friends are not free from criticism in that connection. They are advocates of economy; but they want more branch railways, and they want the Hudson Bay railway. It is not as easy as it looks to economize. Even in the matter of the Civil Service, although hon. gentlemen talk glibly of economy in that direction, one of the hardest things in the world, as any hon. member who has been in office knows, is to cut down the Civil Service. Those who have no responsibility can treat that matter very lightly; but I can tell hon. gentlemen—I do not need to assure those who have held office—that even in that matter, a policy of economy may very easily cause trouble. I would be as glad as any other hon. gentleman in this House if we could have a larger measure of economy. But Canada is a comparatively undeveloped country; we have great needs; we have in every part of the country many works which call for attention. Some of them possibly can wait; many of them are urgent, and if the wheels of progress are to keep moving, we have to respond to