

worked with my French-Canadian brothers and knowing something of them, I appreciate why they show such a keen regard for their mother tongue.

The mover of the Address in the course of his speech made a few statements to which I desire to direct the attention of the House. He said that in the early part of 1922, when the present administration took control, they realized that if a country with a population of nine million and a debt of \$2,400,000,000 were to make progress there must be reductions in the public debt and a policy of rigid economy. We have had in the Speech from the Throne somewhat similar sentiments. Well, I thought, it was too bad that the mover of the Address had to speak before the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), for if he could have had the benefit of listening to that hon. gentleman he would have discovered how in the past four years that policy of economy had been put into effect. At page 246 of Hansard the Minister of Agriculture is reported as speaking of the many great public undertakings that his government had carried out, such as the Welland canal, the Toronto viaduct, the bridge at Montreal, the harbour improvements at Quebec. I say, Sir, there was "economy" with a vengeance! On the other side of the line the greatest question confronting the United States government was the necessity for rigid economy and they have carried out such a thorough policy of retrenchment that to-day their income tax is reduced, their stamp tax has been abolished, as well as several other taxes, and they are more strongly entrenched in power than ever because of having carried out the policy on which they were elected. By contrast with the policy of our neighbours I thought of the costly undertakings which the Minister of Agriculture enumerated a few days ago. According to the figures given to this House \$572,000,000 has been expended on the national railways during the last five years, the major portion of it by this government. A consideration of this and other facts gives us some idea of what real economy means as practised by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am aware that the \$572,000,000 was challenged by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) and I shall deal with this point in a moment or two.

According to the figures in the public accounts, the public debt of Canada when this government came into office was \$2,340,000,000. If we take the proportion of the railway expenditure and the \$77,000,000 which was added to the public debt according to the records, we find to-day that our commitments are close to \$2,750,000,000. Now, where is there

any reduction in the public debt? Is it to be argued that if you give your note and get money on it, or the equivalent, that you do not go into debt? Well, if that is so it is a new system, and we hope we may be able to avail ourselves of it during the next three or four years. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott) laboured for some time to show that a reduction in the public debt had been made, but the further he went the more apparent it became that his government had greatly increased our national obligations. He said that the total disbursements for the year just passed—I suppose he meant for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1925—were \$339,000,000 odd. But I find in looking over the public accounts that another \$17,000,000 must be added to capital expenditure, and approximately \$118,000,000, according to their own figures, was spent on Canadian National Railways account. These give us a total of \$474,000,000. This divided by nine million, the population figure used by the hon. member, gives us a per capita expenditure for that year of \$52.80 instead of \$37 as claimed by him. Well, instead of the reduction of \$14 per capita that he gives his government credit for having effected as against the expenditure under the preceding administration, we have actually an increase of \$7.40 per capita, according to his own method of computation. I am not particularly struck with his method, but I follow it simply to make my comparison intelligible.

The hon. gentleman also gave the House some comparative figures on the cost of agricultural implements to the consumer. I should like some hon. member who knows all the facts to give this House the exact reductions—if there have been any—that have been passed on to the farmers of western and eastern Canada by virtue of any tariff reductions, because then we would be able to place alongside those reductions the fact that industries in Ontario have been put out of business by virtue of those tariff changes. The best information I have been able to obtain is very dissimilar to that which has been presented to the House, and I desire to mention some of the prices quoted by my hon. friend. I hold in my hand two price lists of the Massey-Harris Company, one for 1925 and the other for 1921. In 1921 the hon. member told us that the cost of a binder was \$335, whereas in 1925 it had been reduced to \$268.50. I cannot vouch for my 1925 Massey-Harris catalogue being the latest edition issued by that company, but it is the most recent one I have been able to obtain. I find that for 1925 the price was