

*Wages—Income Tax—Rationing*

could move it now, as follows, seconded by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion):

That all the words after the word "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "This house is of the opinion that it is expedient that measures be taken by the government to remove amongst Canadian workers the causes of justifiable discontent brought about by the government's policy in relation to frozen wages, unjust methods of imposing income war taxes, and in the rationing of certain food products."

In my opinion this unfair situation could be corrected by creating a special category of coupons, as we do in connection with gasoline. Those patronizing restaurants and hotels might keep the coupons they now have, while those who are not able to go to restaurants but who are obliged to get along on their rations might be given a special category. The difference between the two categories might be this. If the government cannot import any more sugar than it is importing at the present time, those in the first category might be allowed one-third of a pound a week while the workers and those who do not use restaurants at all might be given two-thirds of a pound. This would equalize things; the net result would be the same, but the injustice would be removed. The same thing would apply to butter, if necessary, but in that connection I wonder if the present ration of half a pound per week could not be increased for everyone. According to some figures I saw in the newspapers last Saturday our production of butter increased by nearly four million pounds in the month of March. In March, 1942, our production was 11,729,900 pounds, while in March of 1943 our production was 15,594,614 pounds, an increase of 3,864,714 pounds. I think therefore the government should be in a position to increase the ration. If that cannot be done, however, something of the kind I have suggested might be undertaken so that one-third of a pound would be given those who are in a position to get butter and sugar without having to surrender coupons—I mean those who eat in restaurants—while two-thirds of a pound could be given those who do the hard work and who do not eat in restaurants.

We are told that meat rationing is to be introduced next month, and I believe the same principle should be followed in that connection. The other day the minister announced that the government might institute one more fish day a week, in order to save meat. I submit to the minister that the Roman Catholics, who comprise about fifty per cent of the population of Canada, already have one fish day every week, namely Friday, and also a good many Wednesdays during the course of the year. So that if it would not disturb

[Mr. Roy.]

others in Canada I would ask that the minister have the fish days on Wednesdays and Fridays, so that we might not have more than two fish days a week, which is quite enough. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) tells me that is the way it is being done in the United States.

I also contend in my amendment that there is some discontent in regard to the methods by which income war taxes are collected from the people. So far as the family man is concerned, I think enough has been said already by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay last Thursday afternoon, by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) this afternoon, and also by many other hon. members. I hope the government soon will become convinced that something should be done in this connection in order to straighten things out and give more encouragement to those who are bringing up large families for the benefit of the country.

I should like to add a word on this point. If a married man with many children is not allowed as great a deduction from his income as a single man or a married man having no children, it does not mean he is not paying more taxes! In fact, under our general scheme of taxation the man who has a big family is paying much more in taxes than the man who has no children. That is so because everything he buys in the stores is taxed, and because he buys more he is taxed more than the single man. Let us not forget that.

Another reason why the people of this country are discontented, is that they will be compelled to pay, on top of this year's taxes, one-half of the taxes they were supposed to pay for the period between January and September of last year. Yet they are so heavily taxed to-day that they can hardly pay this year's taxes, and they are worried about where they are to find the money with which to pay the amount due for last year. That is why people are asking why the Ruml plan was not applied in its entirety. They are not satisfied with the present arrangement, and this is one matter I suggest the government should reconsider.

There are some other points I might speak about, but I shall do so on a later occasion.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think before the question is put I should say a few words. I would turn first to the observations of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) with respect to cost of living bonus as it applies to civil servants. I have made no secret of my position with respect to the payment of cost of living bonus to superannuated civil servants. My position is on this ground: A civil servant,