

gentleman really wants a substantial list of woes, let him consult his own associates from the province of Alberta. Why, they could furnish him with an unvarnished tale of woes that would make each individual hair stand up like the quills upon the fretful porcupine, and the pity of it is they would all be true. That is the tragedy of it. They would all be more real than the rather academic and thumb-worn general proposition which he has seen fit to include in his pronouncement. I think he would have been well advised to have left out that part of his amendment, because it is a proposition with which we all agree, and the list is not in any way complete when he limits it to the one thing. He says:

This House views with alarm the increase in the national debt and urges Your Excellency's advisers to exert every possible effort to economize in the expenditure and administration of government.

I agree with that. It is proper that we should have economy in the expenditure and administration of government; I think they mean about the same thing. But I want more economy than that. I want to see economy in the management of our railways, that great enterprise that has passed out of the hands of the government and in which the people of Canada are vitally interested. I want to see economy in the management of our harbour commissions and terminal elevators, and in all our great quasi-public institutions. I go further, I want to see economy in all the railways and among all the people of Canada. We must have economy everywhere. The trouble with that part of the amendment is that it does not go far enough. It is limited to the expenditure and administration of government. My friends to my right seem to think that is all we should economize on in this country, but I do not agree with that at all.

The amendment goes on to say that the purpose of this economy is "to lessen the burden of federal taxation." That is a very commendable thing to do, and I am in favour of it. I think we would be very wise indeed if we were to practise economy everywhere and lessen the burden of taxation. But I would go further than that. I would say that we should conserve our resources to such an extent that we can not only cut out this deficit but pay something on the national debt and carry on all the great public improvements that are needed. We might improve the harbour at St. John, for instance, and at Quebec and Montreal. We should complete the Hudson Bay railway. Let us economize to that end. We should send out feeders to our railroad lines on the prairies—

[Mr. McConica.]

build branch lines. My good friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) some little time after the new Board of Railway Directors was appointed, and before they had had their first meeting, I think, certainly long before Sir Henry Thornton came from England, is reported to have said out in the West that they were going to build a lot of lines on the prairies. I do not know how he got his information. I thought Sir Henry Thornton was the man to make a statement of that kind. It embarrassed me a good deal, because I could not back it up. I did not know, and I did not know whether he knew or not. If he did, I would like to know how he found out, because I do not think Sir Henry Thornton knew as he had not then seen the railways.

But I want to see economy. It will assist us in that respect, it will assist us in the building of the terminal facilities out at Vancouver. I do not want to limit our economy to merely relieving the burdens of taxation. The qualifications that the hon. gentleman has put in here are words of limitation. They cut down the scope of our aims. If I had drawn that amendment I should have said, "I am in favour of economy," that is all. Economy is what we want—economy in administration and expenditure, economy in the operation of every public enterprise, and in our own private lives, and to the end that we may not only reduce the burdens of taxation but that we may build up this country to the future that certainly lies before us. When that is done we shall have the results which are spoken of here, and many more blessings will follow in its train. So I say this amendment does not commend itself very much to me.

Now what is the pronouncement of His Excellency? He says that the public accounts will be down soon, and declares that a strict economy in all public expenditures continues to be a necessity. Now, does not that cover the matter pretty thoroughly? Is not that just about as broad as you can make it? I ask the hon. gentlemen on my left, does that not mean a lot more than the statement of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw)? I think it does, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the first place this amendment is not germane to the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey); it does not touch a single thing that is contained in that amendment; it is not relevant in the most remote degree; and I do not quite understand how it was held to be in order. It is also a contraction of the declaration of His Excellency. The Governor General de-