

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is only a tenth of the vote.

Mr. COCHRANE: That does not matter. We do not need to spend it, even if we pass it.

Mr. MACDONALD: The answer which is continually given the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when a reduction of expenditure is suggested, is that the Government do not need to spend the money simply because it is voted. If they do not need to spend the money, they do not need to vote it. That seems to be a very ready answer to that argument. When the Minister of Finance talks to the people of this country about economy in their personal expenditure, one sits aghast when he observes the reckless manner in which the country is rushing into debt and extravagant expenditure, and into taxation which will become of a most serious character day by day, on account of the necessary obligations incurred in the conduct of the war. In view of the manner in which my hon. friend has dealt with these matters, he cannot expect the people to listen to his appeals for the exercise of economy. We are asked by the Government to vote a total estimated expenditure of \$254,014,238.29, of which the statutory expenditure amounts to \$74,000,000, in round figures. The item for interest on public debt amounts to \$57,720,000. The country has been asked to respond to the special impositions made upon them, on the ground, forsooth, they are necessary for the war. Instead of coming to Parliament and saying: Give us this money; if we do not need to expend it, we do not have to, my hon. friend himself should give the people a lead by practising economy. In his public financing my hon. friend disregards the very first essentials of economy. For instance, take the ridiculous votes for the Quebec and Saguenay for the purpose of carrying out private arrangements with private parties; the unnecessary expenditures for the extension of railways, which hon. gentlemen know cannot possibly be made use of until the war is over; votes for telephone expenditures in British Columbia intended for election purposes. When hon. gentlemen talk about patriotism and economy and at the same time practise the very reverse, they can hardly expect the people of the country to take them seriously. The matter to which the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) referred is an illustration. Even if the Hudson Bay railway were completed to-morrow, it would

[Mr. Cochrane.]

be absolutely impossible to get a single vessel to go to Hudson bay for years to come. The transportation services of the country have been so impaired that ordinary products cannot be transported across the ocean; in the Maritime Provinces we cannot get coal from Boston: Gentlemen who live in the centre of Canada, who have the advantage of transportation by rail, have no idea of the conditions that prevail in connection with marine and transportation, particularly in the Maritime Provinces. The expenditure referred to by the member for St. John would, therefore, be absolutely nugatory for years to come, even if the Hudson Bay railway were soon completed to Port Nelson.

The people submit willingly to taxation that is necessary for the purpose of maintaining our part in the war, but they object to giving out of their incomes and out of their profits money that is diverted by the Government to unnecessary works that could well be postponed until these larger problems are settled. I pointed out the other day, when dealing with this question, the debt which rests upon Canada—a debt which is the result of the attitude taken by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to railway and other problems. That debt now amounts to \$2,000,000,000, with another quarter of a billion in addition, upon which interest has to be paid. Is there to be no end to this riot of expenditure and extravagance? When the war is over, is our financial condition to be such that no man will venture to come to this land of hope and promise because of the tremendous burden placed upon the country by the reckless mismanagement of this Government during the last five years? If the men who come to Canada must pay an impost greater than that which he would have to pay in almost every other country, greater than which he would have to pay in any other part of North

4 p.m. America, what is the use of hon. gentlemen prattling about the flow of immigration to Canada? If present conditions continue, we cannot look forward with any degree of confidence to Canada's re-establishing herself when the war is over. When the Government are asked why they do not implement their promises to the people, they say: Oh, we do not want to spend the money; yet when they are given the right to spend money, they do spend it. The Government should say to the country: we will not ask a single dollar from the people; we will not ask Parliament to vote a single cent, unless the