

figures that he used were taken from figures submitted by a manufacturer to the special committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions. Although the figures are given in regard to binders only, no doubt they can be applied to agricultural implements as a whole. The figures are as follows:

	1913	1922	Increase per cent
Materials	\$ 45 55	\$ 86 21	89
Wages	25 10	56 77	126
Factory expenses	5 51	26 55	382
Administration	5 10	38 66	658
Freights	23 91	34 69	45
Distribution	29 41	63 15	114
Branch department	29 41	47 31	60
	\$163 99	\$353 33	116

So that, taking the total in these nine years, the increase on binders would be 116 per cent while freight costs have increased 45 per cent and implement manufacturers' employees' wages 126 per cent. It would therefore be interesting to the people of Canada to have the manufacturers explain how they have come to have an increase of 658 per cent in administration costs. This I think is a fair example which might be applied to a good many other industries; and it shows in my opinion that the cry of high freight rates being caused by high wages is nothing but a smoke screen for them to hide behind in the conduct of their own affairs. It seems to me that the conditions governing the administration and the operation of the railways here are such as cannot be compared with the conditions that obtain on many of the roads of the United States. I would point that out before going further. We have extreme weather here and the conditions in that regard are not experienced across the line; this applies particularly to the use of equipment for the seasonal carrying of grain and other perishable products. The railway reports show that something like \$4,000,000 is the expense incurred in snow service on the roads in Canada. These facts are all taken into consideration in the adjustment of wages and I believe that the entire figures will show that the wages paid railway employees on this side are lower than those that are paid in the United States, the roads being equally well operated and managed.

I come now to the last reason for discussing the budget; I must state my position on the motion now before the House, that Mr. Speaker leave the chair, as well as on the amendment that has been introduced by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). That amendment will of course first be voted on; and having declared my views on the questions affecting my own

district, and not unmindful of the associations I have held in parliament, but remembering the duty I owe my constituents as well as the country at large, I believe there is only one course open to me. It is my intention to support the budget at this particular time and in doing so I feel that I am carrying out my duty to my constituency and to the country. I do not want to have it inferred, that I am in any way governed by political influences. But I believe that it is in the best interests of the country that the budget should be supported, although I know that some of my friends with whom I associate at the present time do not agree with this view. It must be remembered, however, that conditions in the province from which I come are extremely different from those in other parts of the country; it has been recognized as a concession to myself and other members from British Columbia that we have certain conditions there that do not exist anywhere else. For this and other reasons that I have stated, I shall have no hesitation therefore in giving what support I can to the budget.

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (East York): Confidence, lack of confidence, and restoration of confidence was the keynote of the first portion of the remarks that fell from the lips of my hon. friend from West Kootenay (Mr. Humphrey). My associations in this corner of the House lead me to say there is no one here in the Conservative party who will in any way take second place to my hon. friend so far as having confidence in the country is concerned. But surely the hon. gentleman is not going to confound confidence in the country with confidence in this government. Is this government the country? Is it fair to say that this government to-day is a fair reflection of the country? Has it a mandate from the country to-day?

We all regret the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding); we all regret that stability has disappeared from this government owing to the fact that the right hon. gentleman is not here. We think of the Fielding Liberals; where are they? And we are all wondering perhaps why the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) is not in his place to-day. Where are the Gouin Liberals, and what do they think of this administration? Have the Protectionist Liberals a right to sit in this House behind this administration? And has the administration any mandate from the province of Quebec? I question very much whether it has! If it has a mandate from the province of Quebec I should like to see the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) in his place; I should like to