

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is hardly worth while to explain to the hon. member; he would not understand it. I will, however, say this, that this takes no account of my municipal taxes, and I can say that I had hardly enough left to pay my board here in Ottawa. The hon. member would not understand it if you did tell him; so why argue?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I have invited the hon. member for York-Sunbury to place on record exactly how much was left of his income from the federal treasury, leaving out of consideration entirely any other income he may have had.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not propose to expose my private business to the curiosity of the hon. member for Mackenzie.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I have not asked the hon. member to expose his private business; I am asking him to correct the figures I have just given.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister has corrected the hon. member.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The minister has not placed on record exactly what the figures would be. The minister has his assistants with him, and I would appreciate it very much if he would calculate how much a citizen of Canada with a taxable income of \$14,000 plus an additional \$2,000 that is not taxable would have left. I was going by the figures contained in this table.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I rise to a point of order. I think this discussion about my income tax is entirely out of order and not germane to the matter under discussion. I appeal to the sense of fairness of this committee, if I cannot appeal to the sense of propriety of the hon. member, not to indulge in this kind of talk.

The CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, I feel that the hon. member has been making statements that come very close to the borderline of personal matters, and I think he should not make further statements concerning the personal and intimate affairs of an hon. member.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I merely referred to a complaint that was made previously by the hon. member for York-Sunbury, in discussing this question. I am selecting his category to discuss, so that hon. members of this committee may decide—

Mr. McCANN: Select your own category.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am quite prepared to do that. The point I wish to make is that

[Mr. Nicholson.]

this administration has not gone nearly far enough in taxing those with incomes of \$14,000 a year or more.

An hon. MEMBER: What about those getting \$4,000?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes; the hon. member for Rosedale wanted sympathy for those in the \$3,000 category. According to this table a married man with two dependents, and with an income of \$250 a month, would pay a tax of \$44.02 a month.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That was for last year.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes; the new tables have not reached me yet. Under last year's taxation he would pay \$44.02, which still leaves him more than \$200 a month. If we are to have a million and a half of the young people of Canada in uniform and in our munition factories; if they are to be fed, clothed and equipped, it is as plain as A, B, C that the citizens of Canada must make some adjustments in their way of living. I submit that those who are in the highest income groups certainly should not complain in this house. For my part I hope the minister, instead of listening to the representations which have been made by the Progressive Conservative party, will adhere to the decision at which he has arrived and next year go even further than the present legislation, because those who are in these categories are still able to go into the market and buy consumer goods, thus maintaining pressure on the price ceiling. They cannot really complain about having to tighten their belts and make tremendous sacrifices.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I listened intently to the hon. member for Rosedale, and just in case the minister might be inclined to relent after hearing that impassioned speech on behalf of those receiving investment income, I wish to remind the minister that there is no reason to believe that those receiving investment income are not as capable of earning their income as are those who have to do without investment income. There is no reason to believe that they cannot subsist on the mere pittance they receive from investments. In other words, that is not necessarily the only income on which they have to live.

In the second place, the hon. member complained of \$3,000 being a comparatively small amount even for a widow to have to live on. I would remind him of our old age pensioners, widows of veterans of the last war and widows of soldiers in this war by