

for only about thirty-nine or forty seconds; thereafter he had to look down to see him. I take pleasure in saying this, but I do not say it with any feeling of animosity toward the hon. member for Parry Sound. I have great friendship for him, but he was so far wrong last night and what he was saying was so dangerous that the only possible course open to the minister was to do what he did.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): What parts are you referring to?

Mr. MAYBANK: If the hon. member does not understand me fully, I shall have to explain it by drawing a blueprint for him after the session. In the case of most people it will not be necessary for me to draw a blueprint in order to make myself understood.

I consider that what happened yesterday evening was absolutely necessary. A doctrine of that kind should not be introduced at a time like this, at a time which may prove the most harmful in the history of this country. There is nothing more dangerous than to meddle with our money system at this particular time.

Mr. FAIR: The foundation is not very solid, is it?

Mr. MAYBANK: That may be your opinion about that. Surely if a person knows that we are in one war with somebody on the outside, he should realize that it is no time to get another one started on the inside. There are always those who are spoiling for a fight, so much so that they will turn round and hit anybody just to have more rows going. As I say, I felt it was necessary for the Minister of Finance to act as he did, and that is the only reason why I am so pleased that he did so.

Probably I shall not go into the merits of the proposals of the hon. member for Parry Sound, but I do wish to draw this to the attention of the committee. Yesterday evening he followed the accepted canons of oratory. He made two or three remarks in order to attract the attention and sympathy of his audience, he carried them along with him while he discussed the sad position of the officer in the army, the married man as opposed to the single man, and so on. He did that in order to bring the crowd under his spell, and then he enunciated his main doctrine.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is the creation of atmosphere.

Mr. MAYBANK: The creation of atmosphere is, I believe, the name of that particular method. At any rate, it was well done, except that if one thought, as one

listened to the hon. member, it became apparent that it was not being so well done. Sometimes one can so lull one's audience that they will not think, and clearly that was the design of last night's performance. This was what struck me, for instance. The hon. gentleman dealt with the cases respectively of a bachelor and a married man, in the \$3,000 bracket. He pointed out that the bachelor was taxed \$1,064 and the married man \$884, and that the difference for the purpose of supporting a wife was \$180. He brought it out that what the government evidently intended was that a man should support his wife on \$180, the difference between the tax imposed upon the married man and the tax imposed upon the bachelor. That amounts to 49 cents a day, as the hon. member feelingly pointed out, to keep a wife and supply her with everything she requires. I felt that there was something wrong with these figures. After reading the budget, after hearing the minister make his main speech on it, I knew that I was going to have a more difficult time in my life supporting a wife and two or three kids than I had had before. But, good Lord, I never thought it was quite as tough as that, that I had only 49 cents a day for her, and I could not help thinking in consequence, when the hon. member for Parry Sound spoke, that the moment any member of his audience started to think, that hon. member and his argument were lost. He was all right as long as he had a completely thoughtless audience.

In the first place, the bachelor is not taxed \$1,064, and in the second place the married man is not taxed \$884. Those, of course, are the figures of gross taxation. The married man with two children, he went on to say, is taxed \$668, which means that all he is allowed is \$396 a year to support his wife and these two children, which is \$132 for each of them, and he went on to tell us just what could be purchased with the \$132. As I recall, he got it down to the point where it was very doubtful if they could be brought up in the manner in which the Scotch are said to have brought up their children, on porridge and the shorter catechism. Even that was not possible. He did not put it this way, but I felt when he was speaking that he was telling us that we should have to stop giving them even the porridge, and that they would have to get along on the shorter catechism. The shorter catechism is excellent for the intellect, but it does not help the stomach.

The facts of the matter are these. The single man may pay \$1,064, but he may pay only \$824. If he has life insurance it is easily possible that the man with a salary of