

Mr. HARTT: My good friend from Rose-dale has the first syllable of his constituency's name properly placed, the first of which is Rose, who is placed in St. Vincent de Paul and as for the other part of the name we will put a Liberal in his seat at the next election in Rosedale.

An hon. MEMBER: Try to do it.

Mr. HARTT: There will be no difficulty at all. Let the Tories just keep on as they are going and they will be dwindling and evaporating like exhausted volcanoes very soon.

We have reduced the national debt by \$350,000,000, or by the amount of the surplus. One hon. member who posed as a great economist asked, What bonds did you retire, bonds in the hands of commercial banks or bonds in the hands of the Bank of Canada? When you pay off a debt, whether you pay it to one creditor or to another, you reduce your debt by that amount. That is elementary, so elementary that even my hon. friend can understand it. I do not mean the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett), who wears a red tie tonight. I think he is coming our way. He could not have lived all these years in the province of Quebec and be anything else.

Then our hon. friends opposite complain of the income tax reductions. They are never satisfied. If the reductions had been less they would have said, why not more? If the reductions had been made for people in other brackets they would have said, why not reduce it somewhere else? I am a plain man, and I know that when I draw a cheque on my bank account, money goes out, and that when I make a deposit money goes in. That is plain, elementary, and my stenographer understands that, too, without having been elected for some constituency. Every newspaper, every accountant, every man that knows anything about budgeting knows that the average income tax has been reduced by fifty-four per cent, of which twenty-nine per cent is in the lower brackets. Every periodical, every newspaper, every economist admits that. But what do our hon. friends opposite say? They say, why did you not reduce the hidden taxes, the indirect taxes? It is like the boy who kills his father and pleads for mercy, being an orphan.

Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of the indirect taxes, and it was they who introduced them. They introduced the income tax. Every indirect form of tax is their baby, and now they want to lay the baby at our door. Let them bring up their own baby. I remember that we had no income tax until the first great war and I remember how prices went up. The members of the Progressive Con-

servative party are travelling backwards like a lobster. Suddenly they shift their position from the aristocratic group, from the money bags, those fellows who clip coupons, to the middle class. The financial critic for the opposition cried woefully: Why did not the middle class receive the necessary relief? Since when did I hear a Tory speak for the middle class? Why, they are now indulging in poetry, lyric poetry. Actually they have only one class and that is the exploiting class. High tariffs—that is what they want. I sympathize with them. A drowning man will clutch at a straw. They thought that by putting "progressive" on to their name they had accomplished something. The bolsheviks did the same thing. They called themselves "progressive labour." The Tories call themselves "Progressive Conservatives." There is a contradiction in the name. One counterbalances the other. You cannot conserve and go forward. You have to stand still in one place. That is self-evident.

They cry for the middle class, and to cap it all, what did they do? I shall put some chocolate around it if my hon. friend likes that better. What did do? They moved an amendment. It divides itself into three parts like Gaul, and there was plenty of gall in the amendment. You remember your Julius Caesar: *Omnia Gallia in tres partes divisa est*; all Gaul is divided into three parts. And was there gall in the amendment? I submitted it to a jurist whom I consider an intelligent man. Here is what he said. The amendments, disregarding their intrinsic value, have for effect one thing. They admit that there is a fifty-four per cent reduction in the income tax. The opposition admits that, but because they are dancing the dance of long, long ago they introduce an amendment, and they say to the people of Canada in effect, there is a reduction of fifty-four per cent, but we shall move an amendment. If we win, you, the people of Canada, cannot get that reduction. There has never been anything more ridiculous in political history than in moving that amendment.

I come now to the third part of it. The refutations of the first two parts are self-evident, but there is one that I am keenly interested in, namely, the calling together of the provinces and provincial agreements. Well, who is holding out here? Tory for Tory; we have two Tory premiers, no matter what they call themselves. These Tories hold out against an understanding with the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. TIMMINS: No.