

citizens should buy war bonds and that there shall be compulsory saving—that is where our idea came from, but when these taxes are paid there will be nothing for the people to save—sixth, that scarce commodities must be rationed, and seventh, that buying on credit must be discouraged and repayment of debts and mortgages encouraged. Those are the seven points of the United States budget. They give the objective there for the coming twelve months, in war and in peace, and for civilian workers as well. In our budget, however, I can find no objectives for the coming year. The minister is just spending money right and left, taking too much from those who pay income tax, bringing the low salaried man under it, and creating conditions in industry, trade and commerce, and among retailers and small wholesalers which will bring about wide unemployment in Canada, complete regimentation and the absolute ruin of private retail and wholesale business. Those seem to be the objectives, and that policy also has been announced by the controllers, the sub-controllers, the dreamers and the controllers with schemes, who have been foisted upon the government of this country while parliament was in session, over our heads, and over whom we have no control at all, and who spend what they like.

Who are paying this income tax? It is being paid largely by the industrial workers of the two central provinces. They are the people who are going to be hit again, as they have been hit every time since the war started. First of all you talk about your orthodox methods in the budget, but look at the way in which the government has robbed the municipalities and the provinces of their revenues, by coercion, by seizing the income tax which until 1917 was the exclusive field of the municipalities, and then letting them have part of it back. This government is upsetting the whole basis of confederation. The provinces have had their revenues taken away, and therefore we might as well abolish the basis of confederation itself, and abolish municipal and provincial institutions. There is no such thing as an orthodox method at the present time. A great deal was said yesterday and to-day on the question of money. You would think the battle against Hitler was going to be won in this house by an academic discussion—it is nothing more—about the functions of money and the basis of credit. Such a discussion is regrettable, because I do not believe any drastic economic changes can be made while the war lasts. I am not one of those who believe in a new utopia to

[Mr. Church.]

come after the war, but I do say that the present banking and economic system of this country has not functioned as it should during the war, which is one reason why it is being criticized so heavily to-day.

I have nothing against the present Minister of Finance. He is a very hard worker and painstaking. I have a great deal of regard and respect for him, though I do not know him very well except as I see him across the floor of the chamber. From what I have seen he has been a very hard working member of the government, though I do not always agree with everything he says. It has seemed to me, however, that a lawyer is not the proper person for a Minister of Finance, and there is no disparagement in that because I made the same statement ten years ago. The whole training of a lawyer is against him when he becomes Minister of Finance, because he studies briefs, and he has to rely on his assistants and advisers almost entirely. A lawyer is not trained for the vexed problems of the functions of money or systems of credit. There was one great Minister of Finance, Mr. Robb, who was a working-class man; who, as he said in one budget speech, went to work in a mill when he was eight years of age. He was a very able and painstaking Minister of Finance; he sympathized with those who paid the taxes and labour and the farmer and industry, and did all he could to remedy conditions in the country with regard to both capital and labour. Lawyers are all right in their way, but I think they are out of their proper sphere when they dabble in finance. That has been made evident by some of the lawyers we have seen in this house. Look at England. During the seven years' war, the great Napoleonic wars and the hundred years' war, the two Pitts were not lawyers. Burke and Fox were not lawyers, and they handled financial matters. George Canning, one of the greatest chancellors of the exchequer, who kept Britain out of Europe's wars for fifty years, was not a lawyer, nor Palmerston. John Bright was not a lawyer, Disraeli was not a lawyer. Gladstone, a chancellor, was not a lawyer. Mr. Neville Chamberlain was not a lawyer but a plain business man, nor Mr. Churchill, nor Baldwin, nor Bonar Law—all chancellors.

The country cannot stand these high taxes much longer. Look at the great upward increases that have been made in the income tax schedules. The government seems to have forgotten all about those who are dependent upon others for a living, those who are physically unfit, the halt, lame and blind, the aged people and soldiers' dependents who cannot go on relief. The municipality will not give them relief; the province will not give them relief,