

obligations, and we will do the best we can with the fiscal measures which we have proposed to this House and with such borrowings as we may be able to accomplish in the money markets of the world.

My hon. friends, the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), the other night asked the question: "What would any private business man do? Of course, he would shut down at once." The case of a private business man and the case of a government are two very different things. A private business man has no obligations outside of his own business and his own family. He can say: As for me, I will cut down my expenditure; I will dismiss every employee I have. To the credit of the business men of Canada be it said that they have not adopted that policy. A private business man would say: What have I to do with seed-grain distribution in the West? What have I to do with drought-stricken districts? What have I to do when calamity overtakes a portion of this country? He would certainly say: I have nothing to do with these matters; I am a private citizen. **The position of the Government, however, is different.** Government is much wider than business. Government is as wide as humanity. It touches humanity at every point. Business is only a division of politics, and public life is much wider than business life or private life. Therefore, the policy that might be adopted by a private individual is not open to the Government of this country to adopt, if we are to have any regard for the obligations that devolve upon us, charged as we are with the administration of the affairs of this country.

ARE NEW TAXES UNNECESSARY?

My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says: "No new taxes are necessary." Does my hon. friend, who is the financial critic of the Opposition, mean to say that no new taxes are necessary at this juncture? I point out again that, from the right hon. the leader of the Opposition down, there has not been an appreciation—I say it with all respect and with absolutely no intention of imputing any improper motive—of the effect of this war not only upon the trade and commerce of this country, but upon the financial position in which we necessarily find ourselves, and which we have not sought after. In the Budget speech I stated that next year we should require to raise no less a sum than \$300,000,000. I am sure most of the hon. members realize what \$300,000,000 means. Are they aware that every day of the year, if we except Sundays, I shall have to provide no less a sum than \$1,000,000 for the expenditure of this country on war and on purposes other than war? Our expected revenue for next year was \$120,000,000, so that there is a difference of \$180,000,000 to make up. Yet the hon. junior member for Halifax says: "No new taxes are necessary." I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if they do not understand the situation the people of this country do understand the situation; and one reason why my Budget was so well received—as it has been well received—throughout the country, was the profound and instinctive judgment on the part of the people that we had faced our situation and not temporized with it.

Now, the money for war is borrowed; and my hon. friend put forward this view: You are obtaining so much from the British Government. But we are borrowing the money just as much as if we had borrowed it in the open market. We increase the national debt, we are liable for the interest, and Canada is obliged to pay just as if she had borrowed the money in London, or in Paris, or in New York. There is no gainsaying that. What is the use of trying to draw a red herring across the trail?