

what possible good could come from it. They are not criminals, but by associating them with criminals for a year or two or three years we simply destroy what is good in those men, who, after all, were trying to do their duty as they saw it. Any conscientious objectors who are still confined in prison—I know there are some—should be released at once. I agree with the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that a much better method of dealing with military defaulters might be found than by confining them in the jails of this country.

We have to face three particularly great problems, and I shall give them in the reverse order, as I see it, of their difficulty of solution. The first is reconstruction; the second is the enormous debt which we have to carry; the third is the problem of allaying the unrest that prevails throughout Canada. Reconstruction I have placed first; I do not believe that that should be a very difficult matter to deal with. Surely every one will agree that the returned men, the maimed men, should be generously provided for. All others who by reason of their being away have lost opportunities, should have that made up to them. I do not think it should be a very difficult matter to provide for the assimilation of the 250,000 or 300,000 men that are to return to this country. In the years gone by, when immigration was at its height, Canada assimilated from 200,000 to 300,000 men who were not conversant with our conditions and who had to be assimilated into something entirely new to them. That is not the case with the returned soldiers.

The Minister of Public Works (Hon. F. B. Carvell) told us the other evening that the debt of Canada is now \$2,000,000,000, which represents a financial burden of something like \$250 to be carried by each man, woman and child in the country. We have to deal with that. In passing I would like to draw the attention of the House to what I felt at the time was a tremendous waste not only of money, but of patriotic feeling. The Government expended hundreds of thousands of dollars during the last Victory Loan campaign in newspaper advertising in endeavouring to induce the people to realize that they had a patriotic duty to perform in buying Victory Bonds. When they had accomplished their purpose and the people came with open hands offering of their substance to the country, the Government instead of making use of that opportunity, threw it away and made of it merely a cold financial proposition. They made the bonds tax free. I do not

think that that appealed to one man out of twenty of the ordinary working people of Canada. Indeed, they hardly knew what tax free bonds meant. The exemption from taxation feature did not mean very much to them, anyway; nor did these people care particularly. I think those bonds might have been issued at par at 5 per cent interest. In the fervour of their patriotic feelings, I believe the people would have bought bonds issued at 5 per cent. They were not in a calculating mood; they were in a patriotic mood, and if those bonds had been placed at 5 per cent, and this one-half per cent had been saved, this country would have saved for a generation or two at least \$10,000,000 a year in interest.

There is waste in the public service. I have made some inquiries, and I am told that this Government has followed the Biblical injunction, and has made two civil servants flourish where one grew before. To bear this out, we have had the report in connection with the Printing Bureau. I should like to say that I think the report with regard to the Printing Bureau ought to be a hint to the members of the Government to make a like investigation into all the other departments, and they will probably find something of a similar nature.

The other evening the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) made a suggestion with which I could not agree. He stated that in order to make up the deficit of \$125,000,000 with which we are faced, the Income Tax should operate on higher levels and also on lower levels. I quite agree with him in his first suggestion, that the Income Tax on the higher incomes must be raised, but when he states that the Income Tax should be applied to incomes of \$1,000, and perhaps less, I do not agree with him at all. An income of \$1,000 is not equivalent to more than \$500 a few years ago. If a working man gets a thousand dollars a year, what surplus has he, if he has five or six growing children to support under the present conditions of the high cost of food, clothing, rent and everything else in proportion? When the minister said that he proposed to tax these people in order that they might feel that they were helping to pay the taxes, I had no sympathy whatever with that. The workingman of this country has a very heavy load to bear now, and he is to-day bearing more than his share of the taxes. Last year this Parliament adopted what I thought was a picayune policy of placing a tax on matches and tobacco and some other commodi-