

speaking, I do not give the old amounts, 50 millions on the New York market of 5 per cent money; we had 60 millions on the New York market of 5½ per cent money; we had in all 110 millions of direct obligations on the New York market. That is the showing made by the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly wonderful, absolutely remarkable, to see the Minister of Justice sitting there calm and composed to-day. Where is that dread of annexation that possessed him? The rich are no longer quaking. Patriotic men now are sleeping. The extraordinary thing about it is that the Minister of Justice sits there, calm, quiet and undisturbed, although in the short time of one year there has been a direct increase of Canada's obligations in the New York markets of 90 per cent.

Well, there was another thing said, and that is what my right hon. leader stated about the debt. These figures are true; they are the government's figures, they are the exact figures and, therefore, they are true, so far as we know. We accept government figures, but while that is so, the hon. Minister of Finance says, "Oh, if it had not been for these awful railways we would have had a surplus of thirty to forty million dollars". I think, to be frank, he would have had more than that. I am amazed that he is not going to have a very much larger surplus. What was the taxation in the past compared with the taxation to-day? We have had government newspapers talking about the wonderful way in which revenues are kept up. Well, they have been kept up. Where has the money gone? In the last year which has just closed, in which we had very marked deflation, a year of tumbling prices and restricted credits, we nevertheless had a surplus, as reported by my hon. friend in the same accounts of 1922, of thirty-four and a half million dollars, without asking all the people of the country to lick stamps pretty nearly every time they turned around. We had a thirty-four and a half million dollar surplus without the 50 per cent increase in the sales tax. I am amazed that my hon. friend does not give a very much larger figure than the one he has given. Let us go back and take my hon. friend's basis which he says will give him a surplus of from thirty to forty million. On the same basis in the year 1919, I learn from the accounts, there was a surplus of eighty million dollars, at a time when we were attacked right and left by gentlemen now sitting on the other side of the House who at that time were on this side. The figures that year showed a surplus of eighty million dollars. In the year 1920, on the

same basis, the surplus was forty-five million, nine hundred thousand, in the year 1921 the surplus was fifty-eight million, and I have already given you the surplus of 1922 on the same basis, which was thirty-four and a half million.

Then I take another statement that my hon. friend has made. Of course there is an addition to the debt—no getting away from that. But my hon. friend asks: "What is that compared to your additions to the debt?" I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if really at the present time it would not have been somewhat better if the non-partisan attitude of the leader of the Opposition in his address could not have been maintained. Is it really a question of what past deficits were? Is it really a question as to how the money was spent in the past, here, there and everywhere? Is the wrong of to-day right because we had a wrong last year or the year before? Would it not have been better, if recognizing the condition of affairs, recognizing the condition of the country, we were at liberty to forget all party differences, forgetting what has been done in the past and addressing ourselves to a really wise consideration as to how matters to-day can be mended. But, as I said these remarks call for replies. My hon. friend said "why look at the increase in the debt of 1921 and the increase in the debt of 1922." Well, of course, there were increases then; there were very heavy increases. There was not so much said about the size of those increases then as is said now.

But there is another story. Let us again see what is troubling my hon. friend to-day. It is the railways. Why he thinks he may have to spend as much as sixty-seven millions on the railways this year. Well, he has the railways to-day—lines that are functioning. He has them in such a condition that trains stay on the track. He has the deferred maintenance all caught up. He no longer has to think about the rehabilitation of lines of rusty metal. Something has been said to-day about equipment. Why, in the old days when we took those lines over there was every need for equipment. The locomotives were not there to any great extent and the freight cars were practically not there at all. While it is perfectly true that hon. members can in any country—I do not care how big the supply of cars is—at certain times find a car shortage, it is also true that in this very year there were locomotives greased up and laid aside, and cars parked by the hundreds simply because there was no work for them.

If equipment is to be bought to-day, it is nothing compared to the necessities for equip-