

magistrates and all public officials are complaining about the present state of delinquency. Never legislate against human nature, because "he that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord." This is one of the most unchristian budgets I have ever seen in my life. Of course I do not blame the present minister for it but, as I said yesterday, the taxation placed upon the working classes is too heavy. I can tell the committee who is to blame for it; all hon. members know who is responsible. But I do say that under these resolutions the Minister of Finance is taking too much from the taxpayer and not charging enough to capital. Great amounts of money which should not be spent are being spent like water to-day under no public control whatever. One has only to travel about the country to see what is going on. The minister, who is in control of the treasury should put on the brakes and try to prevent these heavy expenditures.

Mr. GILLIS: The longer I am in the house the more doubtful I become as to the sanity of some people, and the more convinced I am that the rules of debate require a thorough overhauling. Practically every hon. member made a general statement on the budget, after its presentation. Hon. members to my right were quite satisfied with it, and, indeed, voted for it. Yet they have spent the last couple of days in criticizing it, and tearing it to pieces. They emphasize the necessity for winning the war, but they do not want anyone to pay for it. I must say that this confuses me, and I am just wondering whether some people are crazy, or whether I am. Had I voted for the budget I would have sat down and kept my mouth shut, or would have helped the Minister of Finance to get it through the house.

Mr. MacNICOL: If we did not speak about it, nobody would.

Mr. GILLIS: Talking about it does no good. Actions speak louder than words.

I rise this afternoon to make an inquiry of the Minister of Finance. Last night in the ten o'clock news broadcast over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation network there was an announcement to the effect that exemptions for members of the merchant marine had been granted to the extent of allowing some deductions for income tax purposes. I have read yesterday's *Hansard* and the newspapers, but I find no such announcement by the minister.

For the past three years I have been interested in this question, and have had some correspondence with the minister with respect

[Mr. Church.]

to it. I was surprised, therefore, to hear the announcement over the radio without first having heard the announcement in the house. My understanding of the radio comment was that war risk bonus paid to the men in the merchant marine and the board they pay while ashore would be deductible for income tax purposes. Would the minister make a statement as to whether or not there was any authority for the radio announcement, and, if so, why it was not made in the house?

If the statement given out over the air is true, in my opinion it is still far from satisfactory. Speaking in the house a few days ago, the Minister of Fisheries lauded to the skies the work of the merchant marine, and rightly so. He pointed out that about 642 merchant seamen had lost their lives since the beginning of the war. I have had correspondence from men serving in that capacity. For example, two second-class engineers point out to me that there is a monthly deduction of \$42 from their salaries. That is a heavy tax, when we consider the work the merchant marine are doing. I do not think there is any service, on the land, on the sea or in the air, making a greater contribution to the winning of the war than is the merchant marine. The member of that service does not wear a uniform. No glory attaches to his job, and much of his time he spends on a raft, drifting around the Atlantic. He takes greater chances than any other man in the service of the country. Nothing short of total exemption, for income tax purposes, of the entire income of the man serving in that capacity will satisfy me.

There is another point I would bring to the attention of the minister. When the federal authorities invaded the provincial income tax field some citizens, particularly in New Brunswick—I have had letters from two men at least—were placed in this position. Previously they had been paying income tax to the municipality, but when the federal government entered the income tax field and people no longer paid income tax to the municipality they were disfranchised and were no longer permitted to vote in the municipality. I corresponded with the Secretary of State, and he informed me that the matter was not within his jurisdiction but that he was bringing it to the attention of someone else. I thought I would mention the matter in the house to the Minister of Finance because he entered into the taxation agreement with the provinces. I think provision should have been made then to protect the franchise of people who have been placed in the position I have just mentioned.

There is another matter on which I wish the minister would make a brief statement. I