

ment, \$354,987 less; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, \$2,945,429 less, or a total reduction of \$6,346,990. If you add that amount to what is being spent, the expenditure this year is actually greater than the expenditure last year, and that from a government pledged to practise economy. Why, their expenditure is greater than ours, and we were economizing in a very difficult time, when there was unemployment, when you had shrinking of values, and disarranged conditions. The government now face better conditions in some cases, because they have denuded the country of the people who were troubling them. They are not worried because of unemployment now, because having done nothing for the unemployed, because, drifting as Canada has drifted for a year without the slightest idea of any fixed fiscal policy, so that no one could come in here with clean, new money and start the wheels of progress, the government has got rid of our people. You hear it said of all parts of Canada, of the West, of the East, and of the Maritime provinces. They are driving them out of Prince Edward Island, too, as the hon. member told us who spoke from that province this afternoon. Yes, the government have less troubles, and yet they are not economizing. Mr. Speaker, something ought to be done.

I just want to give another figure. It is not simply the cost of government, but costs everywhere have gone up so much that somebody has got to start something, and I think we are the people who will have to start it. I want to refer for a moment to railway operations. The increase in the cost of carrying on business in Canada by the railways constitutes to-day a greater burden than was placed on the railways by the war. Hon. gentlemen talk an awful lot about the war debt, but do they realize that the gross earnings from operations from Canadian railways in 1917 were \$310,000,000, and in 1921 \$458,000,000, or an increase of \$147,000,000—more than the whole of our war interest. You have that increase on a business less in amount than we had in 1917, and on the other hand you have operating expenses growing up in a far greater degree. The increase in operating expenses is 89 per cent, as against 32 per cent gross earnings from operations.

Something, Mr. Speaker, certainly is necessary, and the thing that is necessary is economy, and we cannot too much stress it. So far as I am concerned, I propose to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). It is at least one thing: it is a clear, direct call for economy. I am forced to vote for it after hearing the

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, who assures us that increases in the public debt are apt to be necessary. He thought so differently a year ago when he brought down his budget. Then he was not only going to stop deficits, but start doing something towards reducing the war debt. That is why we are licking so many stamps. That is why they put on the luxury tax, and why to-day we are being taxed in every conceivable way we can be taxed and still allow things to carry on. Notwithstanding all that taxation, he says the debt must go up. Under these circumstances I am forced to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary West. At the same time I intend to vote against the main amendment. Sir, we have too much unemployment, we have too much de-population to-day. I am reminded of the appeal sent out only two weeks ago by the Department of Agriculture in connection with the dairying business, in which it was pointed out that there were only two markets and that the real market for the whole of that industry was the home market, and it is shrinking, shrinking sadly. Mr. Speaker, we can stand no further shrinkage. We vote against the main amendment.

Mr. W. G. RAYMOND (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, in order that I might not appear to be transgressing one of the rules of the House, I might perhaps be permitted to say that through the kindness and courtesy of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), who has exchanged places with me, I am not in the place I previously occupied.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the wide range the debate has taken, and the many opinions that have been expressed by the various members—representing a territory stretching all the way from the Yukon to the Atlantic coast—as they have spoken, and I must say it has been very interesting to note the various views that have been given expression to. With the congratulations that have been extended to members entering the House for the first time, I would like to associate myself as well as with the compliments that have been passed, which I do not consider necessary to repeat at this time.

I was very much pleased to hear one hon. gentleman opposite in particular last night. He was giving us a very interesting story of a sale that took place in the West in which two teams of horses—such horses as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) would consider fine, I understand—sold for the sum of \$35, and one second hand wagon sold for \$90. I expected to hear that gentleman say