

sums of which these politically appointed bosses received the benefit? Why did he not tell the house of the item to which I alluded on the orders of the day, where the British Columbia government—I almost blush to say this since I come from that province myself—announced an income tax on relief wages. Imagine a man receiving maybe three or four days' work a month being taxed on income upon those miserable dollars, collected before payment. Is this conceivable? It is hardly believable if it were not given the authority of a circular issued by the provincial deputy minister of public works. I think that statement ought to be embalmed in history as an example of supreme political stupidity, and the minister who gave instructions for that order to be issued should be embalmed also so that children could look at him in a museum and say: That is the man who performed such an act. That also will the people deal with when the time comes.

I wish to protest against the statement made by the hon. member in connection with the young people of our country and particularly of British Columbia. He was speaking about the university of that province, so I presume he was alluding to the students there. He said:

University students of to-day seem more capable and informed upon communism, atheism and companionate marriage than they are upon political economy or any national virtue. . . .

I consider that to be a gross slander, wholly unjustified, upon our young people. I challenge him to give a single instance of companionate marriage occurring among the male students and the co-eds in the University of British Columbia. My own daughter went to that university and when she came back she was not talking communism, atheism or companionate marriage, which is a euphemistic term for free love. I am satisfied there are thousands of our young people, clean living, clean thinking boys and girls, to whom that statement is equally applicable. I deplore, I deprecate the hon. member's using his privilege in the house to make such an observation as he has done. Even a carrion-eating vulture keeps his own nest clean.

Let us pass from the parish politics of the hon. member for Victoria, to the bigger interests of Canada. Might I say in passing, I have no ill-will at all towards the hon. member—just pity! I am addressing myself now to the Canadian situation. We might well say: "Watchman, what of the night?" For surely we are passing through a time of political darkness in the history of this country. My deskmate, the hon. member for La-

belle (Mr. Bourassa), at the beginning of the session made the statement that Canada was looking to the government to give us a lead out of our distress. I agreed with him and he and I made a compact that we would not at the beginning of the session vote want of confidence in the government, to give them an opportunity to develop their policies. The session is nearly over and we might well ask ourselves now: What have we got? We started this parliament, it will be remembered, with the echo in our ears of the grandiose pledges on which the party opposite rode into power. We are all familiar with them, and I shall repeat only one:

Find work for all who are willing to work or perish in the attempt.

These are brave words. They have a fine sound, a magnetic ring, one well calculated to appeal to and capture the imagination of the hesitating and waiting nation and they did capture it, and the Prime Minister received his mandate. But alas and alack the conditions were not fulfilled, the goods were not delivered, but the honourable author of them did not perish in the attempt. Rather he has gone on to higher and higher peaks, seeking the goal of unrestricted authority and unlimited power. But, sir, there was perishing although he did not do it. The perishing, unfortunately, was done by the people. The middle class became poor, the poor became destitute, and the destitute became starving.

What have we had in the last two years? Two years of enormous budget deficits. Two years of enormous and almost unparalleled increase in taxation, and to-day in spite of the great increase in taxation we have every reason to believe that there will probably be a further deficit next year and a further increase in taxation.

Now I come to the question of unemployment. There are two phases to that question. There was the pledge to end unemployment, and the pledge to relieve the distress caused by unemployment. We are nearing the end of the session and we have not yet seen either in the speech from the throne or since any word or suggestion of legislation calculated to end unemployment as such. As regards the relieving of distress we have had a conference lasting one day or one day and a half, a conference which the members on this side frequently advocated last year and were howled down and ridiculed every time they made the suggestion, a conference which if it had been held a year ago would have been productive of greater good and more far-reaching effects than can now be the case.