

Great Britain would be doubly true with respect to a new country like Canada, which invites capital to its shores and gives it the assurance, so far as an implication is concerned, that in this country the investment of capital will be protected and the contractual obligations of the country to pay, whether in gold or otherwise, observed to the last farthing. On that ground I desire to point out to the hon. gentleman that the amendment proposed involves conditions and involves results, by implication as well as directly, which would be ruinous alike to the credit and to the future development of this country.

There is only one other observation that I desire to make with respect to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and that touches upon his effort to make it appear that the changes in the income taxation have been what he is pleased to call in favour of the rich men. Let us look at that. The correct way to put it is this: A man with an income of \$4,000 a year will now pay 80 cents on every \$100. It is true that the taxation begins at a lower level than it did before. The man with an income of \$10,000 will pay \$3.54 on every \$100; the man with an income of \$20,000 will pay \$8.65 on every \$100; the man with an income of \$50,000 will pay \$17.92 on every \$100; the man with an income of \$100,000 will pay \$25.25 on every \$100; and the man with an income of \$1,000,000 will pay \$47.66 on every \$100. To say that the man with the \$4,000 income has his tax increased one hundred per cent is not putting it fairly. What happens is that by reason of the reduction of the exemption the man with the \$4,000 income will pay 80 cents on every \$100. It is not fair to put it on a percentage basis. If you increase the tax from one cent to two cents you are increasing it by one hundred per cent, but to put it in that way does not clearly indicate what the actual increase is. In this case I submit that the hon. gentleman has not stated the matter fairly so far as the result is concerned.

There was one striking thing this afternoon, and during the last few days, which must have been interesting to the members of the house. It has been suggested that in these days of distrust and suspicion and unrest we well might have introduced in this country what the right hon. gentleman mentioned as a labour administration. When I saw the novel sight the other day of the right hon. gentleman moving down to the right for the purpose of hearing more accurately the observations of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth); when I saw the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr.

Mackenzie) coming down to the front and moving down to the right that he might not escape a single utterance of that magic eloquence; and when I saw the leader of the Liberal party in Ontario, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Hepburn), moving down to the front to catch those pearly words of wisdom, I could not help but think that they were saying to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, by their actions, if not in words: Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was flattered and gratified at this apparent attention to his utterances. But I realize that after all there must be a reason behind this, and so I looked into the matter with some degree of care, I find that during the last few weeks the great Liberal party has suddenly blossomed forth with a new organizer. Mr. Vincent Massey, at one time minister extraordinary and envoy plenipotentiary to the United States of America, has now become collector extraordinary and minister in ordinary of the Liberal party. I do not make that statement in any sense unthinkingly, because if any hon. member is interested and will turn to page 4383 of Hansard of last year he will find an explanation, not in my language but in that of the leader of the opposition himself, describing the qualities of the organizer of a party. These qualities are not in his words alone, but he has quoted from the words of Mr. J. A. Spender in his life of Sir Robert Hudson, who was so many years organizer of the Liberal party in Great Britain. Speaking of Senator Haydon, who was organizer of the Liberal party in those days, the right hon. gentleman said:

And may I say that if I were asked to describe the relationship between us, as I have believed it to be all the time, I would do so in the words which are used here by Mr. Spender in reference to the one who held the office of chief organizer of the Liberal party in Britain. So far as Senator Haydon's relationship and my own are concerned—

And then the following words are quoted:—life behind the scenes was one of cheerful and loyal comradeship between men who honestly believed in the policy and principles of their party, and were convinced that in serving it they were serving their country.

And when one recalls the somewhat acute criticisms of the new organizer, which were made within the memory of those within this house, one wonders how that greater comradeship will manifest itself in years to come. Further he says:

What else is said in this volume by way of appreciation of this man who was chief organizer of his party?