

cies. This Board would be independent, and would have no power other than ascertaining the facts and laying them before the Government, and thus before Parliament and the country, so that cases of expenditure which were justifiable would have an easier course in being carried out. Other cases, where expenditure was not justified, but was asked purely for the aggrandizement of a locality, such as building a \$25,000 post office in a place where there was a revenue of \$250 per annum, would be made much more difficult to carry out. If the personnel of such a Board justified themselves, I think that any Government proposing an expenditure such as that which we spent a considerable time over last night, and which met its proper and merited fate, would find their path easier by submitting such propositions to that independent Board and securing its endorsement. It would be a great step forward if this Government would seriously consider the advantages of establishing such a Board.

Hon. J. G. TURRIFF: On this, which I suppose is the last day of the Session, as we cannot amend this Bill in any way and can only accept it or reject it, I wish to take the opportunity of entering my protest on behalf of the Progressive party of Canada against the tremendous expenditure that the Government of the day is indulging in.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUTON: Why is it that the Progressive party never enters a protest that is effectual in the House of Commons?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: They leave it for the Progressive party in the Senate.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: My honourable friend has not paid much attention to what has been going on in the House of Commons. They have protested on many occasions against the expenditure. I wish to point out that, although we are now almost five years after the conclusion of the war, all the Departments of the Government, with the exception of a couple, are adding more and more every year to their expenditures. The only two that show any reduction are those that could not help doing so; one is the Defence Department, and the other is the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Though they are spending much more money than to my mind, they should, still it is a good deal less than it was during previous years, for there can be absolutely no justification for keeping up that expenditure. But all the other Departments are spending more money, and on matters for which there is absolutely no necessity.

I want to emphasize what my honourable friend from Toronto (Hon. Sir Edward Kemp) has said. Where are we heading for, or where are we going to land? As my honourable friend has pointed out, if a businessman or a farmer conducting any kind of work found that year after year, through extravagant expenditures, he was going behind, and was not able to make both ends meet, that he was putting on mortgage after mortgage, there could be only one result—bankruptcy. While it would be pretty hard to bankrupt Canada, as my honourable friend from Toronto said, still it could be done, and to my mind the Government of the day is taking a course which, if not stopped, is going to lead to that very condition.

Let me point out to my honourable friend the leader of the Government, and to the Government itself, what took place this week. A Government was practically wiped out of existence—why? I was out through the country somewhat, and one great thing that defeated that Government—I refer to the election last Monday in Ontario—was that they had advocated economy and had practised extravagance. There were several other factors; I think the wet vote in Manitoba and the dispute between two prominent men in the party helped somewhat, but not as much as one might suppose. What defeated that Government was that they had advocated one thing and practised another.

Now, what did the present Government advocate before they got into power? They advocated economy, yet they have practised extravagance on a scale never before reached in the Dominion of Canada under any government. If a halt is not called, the result is going to be absolutely the same as it was in Ontario.

My honourable friend from Toronto referred to Great Britain reducing the debt of that country by \$500,000,000. How did they reduce the debt? Not by collecting extra revenue, but by cutting off expenditure in the administration of government. Unless we do that in Canada I cannot see what the end will be. I am not usually pessimistic, but if we keep adding from \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000 a year—and the present Finance Minister has estimated that we will this year have a deficit of something like \$90,000,000 the condition of this country will be very serious. Yet, in spite of that, my honourable friend brings down Supplementary Estimates of the most glaring political character that I have ever seen in Supplementary Estimates, and I have been a good many years in one House or the other. What is going to be the result?