

him that we in this country are not taxed nearly as heavily as are the people of the United States and of Britain. Both single and married men are taxed much more heavily in those two countries than in Canada. If I had not been called out I would have replied to the honourable leader of the opposition by quoting some figures that I happened to have in my pocket; and with the consent of the Senate I will give these figures now.

A single person in Canada earning \$1,800 a year pays a tax of \$175. In the United States the tax on a single person with the same salary is \$220, or \$45 more than here; and in Great Britain it is \$361, more than double the Canadian tax. In Canada a married man earning \$3,000 and supporting two children is taxed \$86. In the United States the tax on a similar person is \$133, and in Great Britain it is \$442.

The honourable leader of the opposition said that we are burdened with taxation. Well, honourable senators, it can be seen that we are much better off than the people in either the United States or Britain. We have a long way to go before we reach the rates of taxation that exist in the United Kingdom.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Is the honourable gentleman advocating higher taxes here?

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: No. I am simply making a comparison between taxes in this country and in Britain and the United States.

Hon. Mr. Horner: The leader of the opposition did not say that taxes here were higher than in the United States or Britain.

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: He said that the people here cannot stand the taxes.

Hon. Mr. Horner: And they cannot.

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: I am simply replying to his claim that we are highly taxed, and pointing out that we are not as highly taxed as are the people of the United States and of Britain.

Hon. Mr. Horner: He did not say that we were.

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: No, but he said that we were burdened with taxation. I say that we are not burdened with taxation, and by way of comparison I am pointing out the much heavier taxes that are paid by the people of the United States and of Britain.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Before the debate is closed I wish to answer a criticism, as I understood it, by the leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) of items 583, 584 and 585, under the heading "B—Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940". Honourable senators will note three amounts under this heading, \$2,500,000,

\$700,000 and \$1,500,000. If I correctly understood the criticism of the honourable leader, he said that the item of \$2,500,000 indicated that there had been more unemployment than was anticipated by the government.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Correct.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I say to my honourable friend that it indicates quite the reverse. Let me repeat, the basis of the Unemployment Insurance Fund is that employers and employees pay in X dollars, and this amount is supplemented by a contribution from the federal government. If there had been less employment there would naturally have been a lower contribution by employers and employees; consequently the amount required to be paid by the government would have been correspondingly less. On the other hand, if employment was maintained at a high level, the contributions by employers and employees would be more, and so would be the amount to be paid by the government.

Hon. Mr. Haig: But that does not answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: If my honourable friend will just be patient, I will explain further. I say this item indicates that there has been a higher level of employment than the government anticipated, to the extent of requiring an additional contribution of \$2,500,000. I do not think there can be any question but that my honourable friend's interpretation is wrong.

I am frank to admit that the amount of \$700,000 indicates greater unemployment than was anticipated, for in Newfoundland unemployment was higher than was anticipated.

The appropriation of \$1,500,000 is in much the same category. If my friend had reference to these items only he was quite correct.

Honourable senators will recall that earlier in the session an amendment was passed to the Unemployment Insurance Act providing that, under certain conditions, unemployed persons not in an insurable class were to be paid out of the fund just as if they had been eligible for benefits. A special arrangement was made in that respect, and the sum of \$1,500,000 is now being provided to reimburse the Unemployment Insurance Fund.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Will my honourable friend permit me to say something now, or shall I wait until he moves third reading of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I am quite content that my friend speak now.

Hon. Mr. Haig: I understood that the estimates which came in last November were made up in the previous March; and I thought that by November the government would