

same discontent will be produced, and in the end there will be the same discouragement and the same emigration from the country.

The question before the House, Mr. Speaker, is, first, the motion of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam); then comes the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), and then the amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). The amendment to the amendment simply asserts that the House should view with alarm the substantial increase in the national debt and make every possible effort to economize. I do not think there is an hon. gentleman on either side of the House who will have any fault to find with that amendment to the amendment. So far as the public debt is concerned, which goes into the billions, the question should be asked, have we assets to over-balance those billions? If we have, then the public debt is not such a very bad thing. As to economy, there are two kinds of economy, true and false.

I noticed on the order paper a day or two ago a notice of motion which indicates that the government proposes to expend \$5,000,000 on the improvement of Vancouver harbour. Now, that is a large sum of money, and there are people who will say that that is not economy. But I ask my farmer friends from the West, I ask hon. members from British Columbia on both sides of the House, what they think on that subject. Is that sound economy, or is it false economy? Undoubtedly it is sound economy, and they will answer, that better facilities will be afforded on the Pacific coast for shipping their grain around by the Panama canal and thence to Europe. I say, therefore, that no government should be alarmed at this continuous cry of economy, economy—so long as our economy goes in the right direction. Last year the government undertook an expenditure of, I think, \$5,000,000 on Quebec harbour—a large amount of money. But, surely that is true economy, because such expenditure will result in better transportation facilities for our products. Years ago the Conservative government spent millions of dollars in the equipment of the harbours of Halifax and St. John, thus making it possible for the farmer, the fisherman, the lumberman, all classes in the country, to send their products to foreign lands in the best, easiest and cheapest way. So that the government should, to my mind, look after the public services even at the cost of adding a little more to the national debt. They should not let the magnificent harbours of Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal, Halifax or

St. John go into disrepair because, forsooth, the expenditure of money upon them adds a million dollars to the public debt. The government should not, through the fear of adding a few million dollars to the national debt or because they are afraid of the bogey of economy, refrain from expending large amounts of money on new undertakings which are for the national good.

There is, Mr. Speaker, a problem in this country which I think the government should do something at the present time to solve. I refer to the fuel problem in this country. I am sorry that I have no really effective solution to offer myself. This present year we are told by our good friends the Americans that we can depend upon receiving only a certain number of tons of coal, and if that amount does not satisfy our demands, then we and our children may freeze. I say that is an unfortunate position for a nation such as Canada to be placed in, and it is one that the government of this country assisted by all parties should tackle and attempt to solve.

We have great coal resources in Canada. Our coal mines in the Maritime provinces are illimitable; in the West there are also magnificent resources; and I believe that they are sufficient to fill all the fuel demands of the country. Is the problem so great that it cannot be solved? I fear that we Canadians are sometimes led astray by ourselves. We are too prone to criticise conditions in our own country and to enlarge upon the beauties and fine conditions in other countries. Four years ago, if you were to ask a citizen of Ottawa to throw a scuttle-full of soft Nova Scotia or New Brunswick coal into his grate, he would look at you and say, I suppose: "Do you want an explosion in my house? Do you want the beautiful faces of my children to be blackened and besmirched that their mother will not recognize them when she comes in from ski-ing?" There is a tendency in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, to disparage the qualities of western bituminous coal and of our soft maritime coal. However, a little advertising is going on. I see my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) smiles, and I am bound to say it is a smile of pleasure. To-day this building in which we are seated and all the surrounding public buildings, which are heated by a common heating plant, are being heated by New Brunswick coal from Minto. Are we any less comfortable? Are our faces less clean than formerly because we are using maritime coal, instead of the American anthracite which we cannot get?