

businessman—not those who move in high financial circles. I know, coming in touch with these smaller businessmen that they appreciate what the government has done in the matter of giving them exemption, and I pass that information on to the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell). When one considers half a million taxpayers I do not think he can pass over that number lightly.

Then, I would refer to the hon. member's statement that no one would profit by these reductions. I would point out again that an additional number of wage-earners who are paid by the week, who receive their weekly pay envelopes, will, immediately in 1947, enjoy benefits because of the smaller deductions from their pay envelopes.

So I say to the hon. member that, while he may have looked at it from a high plane indeed, he did not view it from the point of view of the average man on the street, the average wage-earner, who does appreciate and understand what this budget means to him.

The hon. member referred to a balanced budget, and I shall have something to say about that later on. Then, he mentioned economies, and said that no steps toward economy were being undertaken.

Mr. JACKMAN: Hear, hear.

Mr. ISNOR: I hear the former financial critic say "hear, hear."

The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario then dealt with the civil service, saying that whereas before the war there were only 70,000 civil servants, there are 150,000 to-day. He forgot to mention the expanded service rendered by the various departments of government. Surly the hon. member knows that service cannot be given without having sufficient staff. In fact, there has been criticism from time to time that the income tax branch is not sufficiently staffed to give the necessary service. If we are to give that service, then we must have the employees. I do not know if the hon. member was advocating doing away with a large number of civil servants, and thus adding to the unemployment situation.

He referred to the security of private enterprise, and with his comments in this respect I am in accord. I said a minute ago that if we are to have increased production it will have to come largely through that source.

There was one interesting fact the hon. member did not touch upon, and his failure to do so surprised me somewhat. I thought he would dwell at some length upon it, because he had expressed himself clearly on more than one occasion in the house that he, and those he represents, were in favour of immediately doing away with all controls.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): He never did any such thing at any time.

Mr. STIRLING: Never, never. That is a Liberal explanation.

Mr. ISNOR: That is strange, coming as it does from the west. We see the west coming to the defence of Toronto. But I do say the hon. member showed that he defended that principle, and not on one but on several occasions.

Mr. STIRLING: No.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It is a matter of being truthful about the matter. The hon. member has misinterpreted the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario three times.

Mr. ISNOR: We shall permit the record to speak for itself.

Mr. STIRLING: That is better.

Mr. ISNOR: Thank you; I agree with that. Since the evening the budget was presented I have read newspaper comments from one end of Canada to the other—Liberal newspapers, Conservative journals, and those expressing independent views. I have listened to comments from men on the street and in streetcars. I have talked to men in hotels, and listened to them in the corridors in the House of Commons. Like the majority of members of the house I have received scores of telegrams, letters and postcards, some of which speak favourably and others unfavourably.

I have received criticism from businessmen who complain about the reaction from a business point of view and state that business has not received as great a reduction as was expected. I am frank when I make that statement, and say that I have received such complaints. I have received from others communications indicating that they expected higher exemptions for both single and married persons. I have received communications from those who favoured the action taken by the Minister of Finance in reference to cooperatives, and from those who were opposed to any change in respect of cooperative methods.

Yes, I know that members receive all kinds of advice and criticism. I am pleased to say that many useful suggestions are received. Roughly speaking, there came to my hand 600 cards and letters recommending that the government apply income taxation on exactly the same basis on all forms of commercial enterprise including cooperatives, crown companies, municipal and government undertakings and mutual concerns. Many others also