

the people of this country. If our amendment is double-barrelled the reason is that we are dealing with a two-faced government, a government that was elected not to increase the military appropriations for defence but to deal with the serious economic and social conditions within this country.

Mr. FINN: It is doing that.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to see it.

Mr. FINN: Well, look about you.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is because I have looked about me that I say I cannot see it.

Mr. FINN: Your vision is not very broad.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is as broad as the dominion.

Mr. FINN: I hope so. I cannot see that far myself.

Mr. MacINNIS: There is no reason why you should not; it is easy to travel.

Mr. O'NEILL: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. MacINNIS: No; the hon. member will have forty minutes after I have finished.

The Minister of National Defence then went on to refer to the speech that was made by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in reply to the cooperative commonwealth resolution of 1933. He drew our attention to the now famous fourteen points. I have refreshed my memory in regard to the fourteen points which were laid down by the leader of the opposition of that day, now the Prime Minister, and I find that the first of them did not deal with the lack of national security in this country. As a matter of fact, after reading all fourteen points and the whole of his speech, I could find nothing in it regarding national defence. I can find nothing in it referring to the unprotected condition of this country. The following was the right hon. gentleman's first point, which will be found at page 2510 of Hansard of 1933:

As unemployment is a matter of very great concern I shall give it first consideration.

Further on he says that the Liberal party is pledged to introduce a national system of unemployment insurance. But the very first thing this government did when they came into office, this government pledged to introduce a system of unemployment insurance, was to harpoon the efforts that had been made to put such a measure on the statute books of this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that statement ought to go unchallenged. The statement that this government started in to harpoon the unemployment insurance scheme is surely wholly

[Mr. MacInnis.]

incorrect. The government merely sought to get an authoritative expression of opinion which would guide everyone in the country with respect to the legislation, and we have received it. We advised this course at the time the legislation was introduced.

Mr. MacINNIS: The government may have done that, but it did more than that. There are other ways in which we can get an expression of opinion as to whether or not a statute is within the powers of this dominion.

Evidently when this statement giving the fourteen points was made the right hon. gentleman thought that he could put unemployment insurance into effect. If not, why was the statement made? The act having been passed by this parliament, in my opinion it would have been much better to leave it in effect and have some body other than the government refer it to the courts.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes, and spend millions of dollars before finding out whether the expenditures were legal.

Mr. MacINNIS: We might, and we might not. We have taken that course in other matters. That was the way it was done in connection with the Lemieux act. Had that been done, we might have found ways and means of giving effect to the legislation. We cannot do that now, until some more definite ways are found of changing it.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes—illegal ways and unlawful means.

Mr. MacINNIS: When this government was not in office, the great need and the vital problem of this country, according to their spokesmen, was unemployment. However, when they are in office the great problem becomes the defence of the country, and we find them within eighteen months after their assumption of office, increasing military expenditures by 130 per cent. So the unemployed have an employment commission which does not do anything, and the military clique get the hard cash. I recall a motion made during the session of 1935 by the present Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie). It was not a motion of censure of the government of the day for not having dealt with the defence of the country; it was a motion of want of confidence in the government because that government had not taken steps to end unemployment. The motion, in which there is not a word about the need of national defence or the lack of armaments, is as follows:

That all the words after the word "That" in the motion be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

This house regrets that, notwithstanding the specific promises made prior to the election of 1930, and many times since reiterated, and