

believe in building up one side of the country at the expense of or ignoring the other side. We have to have a symmetrical country, just as we have a lake region, a river region, a coastal region and a mountain region. So I believe we have to have industrial occupations as well as agricultural occupations, and our vision—and we think it is a grand vision—is that of a country made great by the development of all its parts geographically, and of all the opportunities industrially which it possesses. We do not believe we can attain that result by adopting this amendment, however excellent a copy it may be of that which the Minister of Finance produced a few years ago. We have, perhaps, the misfortune, judged by the standard of politics of the present day, to have been sincere and to remain sincere still. My hon. friends to my left have never had any difficulty in knowing where we stand on this subject, and that is why, though personally friendly enough with us, politically they have been at more than arm's length. The fact was not that they did not trust us; they trusted us. They more than trusted us; they knew exactly where we stood and where we were going to stand; they did not like our stand, and they were not going to stand alongside of us. But they knew we had convictions and the courage of them and that that courage was not abated, even though we came back to this House the smallest group after the last election. But what have they found on the other side? Gentlemen with convictions? They were expressed in 1920.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All varieties.

Mr. BAXTER: They had an opportunity last session to put those convictions into realization, and now they need the spur and the goad of my hon. friend for Springfield, cursing the barren fig tree to try to make it bring forth some fruit.

We have the amendment to the amendment, moved by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), who wishes to add to the amendment:

That this House views with alarm the substantial 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 and to lessen the burden of federal taxation which bears so heavily on the people of Canada.

To my mind,—and I think I speak for the group with which I am associated—that amendment expresses, not merely our view of what the government of the day should do, but very much more. It expresses something that should be heard and heeded by every administration within

Canada, federal, provincial, civic and municipal. Before the war, in the luxurious ease which Canada enjoyed, she was becoming prodigal; and you can travel through the West from which my hon. friend comes, and you will find marble palaces, which,—though I have no business to criticize, may I express the opinion?—were scarcely needed. All over the country there was a riot of display and of expenditure. But it was easy. We could stand it in those days. We had not the railway problem, we had not the war loan; and either of these, perhaps, we could have stood without the other. But during war time, when everything was moving under pressure, it was a question for this country and for every other country engaged in the struggle, not of what things cost but to get things done. If a shipload of supplies went to the bottom the obvious and the instant thing was to start another ship off. Men could not wait; money did not count. And part of a generation of Canadian people has grown up under that urge and that impetus. Necessarily money was distributed in order to look after the families of men who were suffering for Canada, and the standard of living was perhaps somewhat augmented. So that the country to-day is still expecting to live in the riot, the waste and the luxury, or at least the extreme comfort that we enjoyed when the world was in course of a tremendous upheaval.

Sir, we cannot do it; and if the supreme government in Canada does not set the example of absolute retrenchment in the cutting off of all except the things that are vitally necessary for the development of the country, how shall we expect the ordinary man in the street, the man working for his day's wage, to be content when someone says to him that he must take less? He will say, your government is spending money all the time. He will ask, and I will stand with the rest of hon. members in this House in this regard, because there is no distinction between us: how much work have you people done in the last five days? Some of you make a great fuss about limiting the hours of labour to eight per day. But what is that when you spend only three hours a day or less at work?" Let us stop a bit of the waste here. We can sit at night and on Saturdays, and we can put the business of the House through, instead of in four or five months, within the space of two. I say this in the light of experience. I have had some experience in other places, and I know that I have helped, in a leading position in opposition, by collaboration with the leader of the government, to reduce an eight-week session to one of four weeks, with some spare