

Mr. BLACKMORE: I have listened to the discussion all afternoon and thus far this evening, and I have found that there have been objections to almost every impost proposed in this budget. I have found no one who has given the budget his full approval. I take that as evidence that the whole tax structure is too severe. Of course the minister will say that he must have the money, thereby indicating that there are two points of view which are clashing and that we have not found the right way of doing the thing. I just wish to say that the minister has not allowed for the needs of a people at war. This afternoon he cited the income tax of Great Britain and the income tax of the United States, and indicated that the Canadian income tax structure is no more severe than theirs. Even so, we can understand why the British income tax should be severe, why purchasing power there would have to be limited rigidly, because there is a shortage there of all kinds of goods, a shortage of resources. But that is not true of Canada. We have plenty of man-power and plenty of woman-power to produce all the goods and services that the people of Canada can use, as well as provide all we need for our allies and for the conduct of the war. To say that simply because Great Britain's income tax has to be severe, therefore Canada's has to be, is to draw a false conclusion.

Just to show that there is altogether another side to this question of the needs of the people, I propose to read into *Hansard* a little statement which is found in a publication, *Labour*, coming over from the United States. In the issue of July 14, 1942, I read the following:

The American Federation of Labor has estimated that a family of five must have an income of \$44 a week, at present prices, to live in "health and decency," and of at least \$30 for "bare subsistence."

Figures like that make all the minister's remarks in extenuation of his income taxes look like so much piffle. The minister said in his budget speech that he had in mind a standard of health and decency. During my reply to the budget speech I asked a question which was designed to see if the minister had formed any conception as to what constitutes a decent standard of living, but the minister had no conception, or at least he was not prepared to take the house into his confidence with respect to what his conception was. The advisers to the minister seemed to have no notion whatsoever as to what constitutes decency in regard to a standard of living in Canada.

This tax structure is so severe that the suffering and deprivation which it is going to

[Mr. Graydon.]

necessitate for a large percentage of the Canadian people is so great as to be a disgrace to the minister, and to render an effective war effort impossible—and "impossible" is the word. I think that all hon. members need to do is to multiply \$44 a week by fifty-two and compare that with what the average family will have left when the minister has finished with them this year, or to multiply \$30 by fifty-two, to see how disgraceful this tax structure is.

It will be said that we must have the money. I am not going to enter into a discussion of this subject on this occasion. The hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) deserved well of his country the other night. It was a noble and courageous thing for that man, in the position he occupies in his country and his party, to rise in his place and make the declaration he made, and he would not have made it if he had not believed it to be true. I say that when that hon. member, with all his intelligence and experience, has become convinced that what he advocated on that occasion is true, that may well constitute a warning and a challenge to every hon. member in this house.

Mr. MacNICOL: Did you not hear the reply of the finance minister?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes; the reply of the finance minister was childish.

Mr. MacNICOL: It was a masterly address.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The finance minister's reply was childish. I am not going to take the time to go into it, but there simply was no complete argument or answer to the hon. member for Parry Sound; and the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. McGeer) completely devastated every argument the minister advanced.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is a wonder that they do not join you.

Mr. BLACKMORE: True. It is easy to make smart-Aleck, foolish wise-cracks. To make a sound and factual argument is another and a different matter.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does the hon. gentleman say that the two hon. members did make sound factual arguments?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Most certainly! The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard was unanswerable. I say that the hon. member for Parry Sound did his country a great service on that occasion. He pointed a way which would provide Canada with a means of escape from the dreadful situation of economic slavery into which we are being driven.