

taxes are levied on a man's net income. Is it any wonder that people want to give up their property? This system of socialistic control is all wrong, and it should be carefully reconsidered by the ways and means committee that should be set up to revise our annual budget. As I said the other night, it would be all right if this control system were going to win the war, but it is not. It is not the doubled rate I am objecting to; it is the fact that we have these controllers and regimentation and the nationalization of labour.

Mr. Elliott Little has been appointed director of national selective service. Who is he, and what training has he for such a task? He has predicted the closing down of non-essential industries so as to release workers for the armed services and war plants. The House of Commons was not consulted about this. He made the announcement before the Rotary club here in Ottawa. Is the Rotary club the House of Commons before which he can go and give an opinion, and give directions to 250,000 workers? No definition is given by him of a non-essential industry. Who is going to decide whether these non-essential industries can be dispensed with? How is it going to be done? We are just heading for national bankruptcy, confusion, muddle, delay, duplication and waste, and are only going to bring the war closer to our shores, by such a control policy that no one will be sent overseas.

Is it the war policy of the government to control and administer every walk of life and almost every article or commodity of trade and commerce? If so, it will lead this country to disaster and national bankruptcy and will not help the war effort. It is a funny thing that no one on the government front benches knows how many of these bureaucratic boards there are, what amounts they are spending, the number on their payroll from week to week or month to month, what functions they perform and how it is all working out. If it is necessary to win the war, no one will object, but it is not. I say: beware of this evil, this bureaucracy within our gates, with headquarters at Ottawa. What we are to-day urged to accept as a war necessity, we shall be told tomorrow we must accept it as a necessity of peace days. Therefore the mighty host of bureaucrats at Ottawa, their sisters and cousins and aunts, some in military uniform, if you please, to fight Hitler at home, will be always with us. All I can say of most of their controls is, never were there so many who knew so little about so much. The small independent business man is being faced with ruin and our people are being faced with the loss of their freedom and independence for which the

[Mr. Church.]

democracies are now fighting. In one year Canada has been converted into a totalitarian socialist state without the knowledge of the people or without any authority from parliament. Restraints are being placed upon thrift and upon business being carried on in the traditional policy of free enterprise and individual responsibility. Unless this is checked, it will lead us to trade and commercial ruin, stagnation and, in the end, insolvency amid all these complex controllers and totalitarian maelstroms, with which business is being hamstrung by their overnight social changes and arbitrary conditions which are altogether impossible and foreign to the temperament of the Canadian people and not at all adapted to their circumstances.

Mr. MAYBANK: I rise chiefly for the purpose of asking one or two questions with relation to matters in the budget, but before doing that I desire to advert to some of the remarks made yesterday evening by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght). Anything I might say anent the hon. gentleman's remarks will be critical and not laudatory, and for that reason I am glad that he has just come into the chamber.

It seems to be the fashion for members of the opposition when speaking on the budget to say a few words of faint praise for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilesley). If you are a member of the same party as the minister, apparently you should go to great lengths to discuss him and possibly make some laudatory remarks about his forbears or any other thing that might be favourable to him. I shall not follow that procedure, because I feel that perhaps enough has been said already. If the minister really believes it—I fancy he pays no attention to it—he must be endeavouring to decide whether to wear his halo with a slant to the right or a slant to the left.

I would, however, say this about the minister. I never witnessed anything which gave me more pleasure than the manner in which he quickly and without hesitation rose in his place and traded punches with the doughty member for Parry Sound. So far as I am concerned—of course, others may differ—were I the referee, the decision would be given unhesitatingly to the Minister of Finance, in respect of style and matter and everything else in connection with that particular little bout. I have never witnessed any person demolished more naturally, more completely, more effectively than the hon. member was demolished by the minister yesterday evening. It partook of the nature of one of those affairs when Joe Louis dealt with one of the white hopes whom he saw in front of him