

reduced its expenditure by billions of dollars; France has reduced her expenditure beyond all expectations; and the same may be said of Belgium and of the other overseas Dominions. I say with confidence that not one of the countries with which we were associated in the last war has failed to carry out a most pronounced policy of retrenchment. In Canada, however, the idea has apparently never presented itself to the public mind that retrenchment in expenditure is necessary. We have thrown the doors open, the bars are down, the lid of the chest is open, and an invitation is extended to every spending Department of the country to make whatever raid upon the public treasury it may see fit. I have not observed either this Session or last the slightest inclination on the part of the Government to curb expenditure. It has not seemed to be conscious of the fact that our expenditure is advancing by leaps and bounds, and that taxation is mounting to such an extent that industry is crippled and development has practically ceased. We find the greatest apprehension expressed by the large interests not only in regard to entering upon the extension of enterprises which they at present represent, but even as to their continuance.

Honourable gentlemen, we do not feel at the moment the consequences that must necessarily ensue from the present situation of affairs in Canada, and that at a very early date. Apparently the Government of the day is only reflecting that widespread impression which we find in all quarters, that we can go on expanding our public obligations day after day, week after week, month after month without danger. The Government of the day should be the leader in the movement of retrenchment and economy, but they are not giving the lead in that direction. In this matter of gross extravagance I do not acquit those representing the large interests of Canada, for while they may not be participating in such extravagance themselves, they are not making their protest as they should. If the large interests in this Dominion sit idly by, simply bowing their necks to the yoke, and accept without protest the burdens placed upon their shoulders by the Government of the day, they are equally responsible with the Government that imposes those burdens, if not more so.

The highest patriotic duty that Canadians can render to their country to-day is to realize the danger which faces us. Our taxation is heavier than that of any other country, so far as I can ascertain. There has been a reduction of taxation in Great Britain; there has been a great reduction of taxation in the

United States, where the income tax reduction represents something like 25 per cent. Our taxation to-day is greater than it has ever been.

Is it possible for us to develop the magnificent resources within the boundaries of this great country of which we are the possessors unless we sit down and seriously consider how this can be done, how the expenditure can be cut down, how taxation can be reduced, and how we can extend an invitation to the countries of the world to invest their capital in Canada? Is there any inducement to-day to foreign capital to come into Canada? Is there any inducement to domestic capital? To-day even our domestic capital is lying idle, and capitalists absolutely refuse to invest in the industries or the public interests of this country. No higher patriotism could be exhibited by the people of Canada than by opening their eyes to the present condition of public affairs, particularly touching financial expenditures, which are proving such a menace to our future development.

It would be idle, honourable gentlemen, for me to go into an analysis of the financial Bills which have been presented to us, involving very large expenditures to which we have given exceptional attention during the present Session. In connection therewith I wish to voice a protest against the policy of having to confront those Bills from Session to Session without the Government of the day or the House of Commons having given proper consideration to them. There must be an impression there that the buck can be passed to the Senate. The consequence is that we are subjected to offensive and unjustifiable criticism in the country. Let me illustrate. The Pension Bill was presented by the Government for consideration after prorogation had been announced, not to this Chamber, but to another. It received about an hour's consideration by that Chamber, and was then sent to this House, and we were asked to assume the responsibility of dealing with it, practically while the Governor was waiting to prorogue Parliament. This practice throws an onus upon the Senate which we should not be called upon to assume.

I simply mention this by way of illustration; but the same remarks apply to the Branch Lines Railway Bill of last Session—not Bills, but one Bill, which was submitted in the dying hours of the Session, after prorogation had practically been announced. The Senate was subjected to hostile criticism in the country for rejecting the Bill at that time, the country, not knowing any of the circumstances or conditions surrounding that Bill. The same measure comes down during the present Ses-