

Canada is committed this year to an expenditure of \$300,000,000—almost two and a half times the estimated revenue without this war taxation.

My hon. friend from Halifax, followed by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, says that this is not war taxation. I confess, I had expected better from the right hon. leader of the Opposition, for such a statement is the very acme of absurdity and partisan misrepresentation. I have been abused a good deal about employing the title, "War Revenue Bill," and I propose to discuss the matter for a few minutes. I have been likened to a man who puts out a fraudulent prospectus. But I am not thin-skinned; I do not rise and indulge in heroics at such a charge; I respect the members of this House, and I think I have their respect, even if we do occasionally fight each other. But I have been likened to a man who puts out a fraudulent prospectus, stating this is war taxation when it is not.

#### ALL BELONGS TO ONE FUND.

All this money belongs to the one fund. Let me put it to my hon. friend from St. John City: Supposing that, instead of borrowing \$100,000,000 from the Imperial authorities, I had borrowed that \$100,000,000 in London, or New York or Paris. I should have had my revenue of \$120,000,000, the estimated revenue on consolidated fund account, and also the \$100,000,000 I had borrowed. Does any one mean to say that if, in order to meet that situation and prevent our national debt from increasing at an alarming rate, I bring down a measure for additional taxation to assist the revenue, that is not war taxation? The funds are not earmarked, the money I borrow in London and the money I raise here are all available for the purposes of Government—for the expenses of civil Government, for consolidated fund expenditure, for capital expenditure, and for providing the cost to Canada of this war; these are all mingled in the same fund. I think it is the pettiest quibble ever put forward by a great party to say that this is not war taxation. Take the tax that I am denominating especially a war tax—though they will all be included—that is, the stamp duty, I shall have to pay, and if hon. gentlemen will look at the Estimates they will see that I shall have to pay at least \$7,000,000 of interest upon the debt that we have incurred on account of this war.

It is a melancholy thing for me to be obliged to say—we shall have to provide, if we may at all depend upon the calculations of those experienced in these matters who should be able to make their calculations with a fair degree of accuracy, a pension list, and I am afraid a growing pension list, of between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 a year. Does anybody grudge that a portion of these taxes should be used for the purpose of paying the interest upon this war loan and for a pension list which will insure to the widows and children of those who have given up their lives for the country that they shall not be reduced to penury? Are those war taxes or are they not? Now, come to the other taxes, the sums I am raising by means of tariff increases. What has caused me to raise the tariff? I pointed out that my borrowings were cut off in the markets of the world; I cannot go to the London market and get a dollar except with the consent of the British Treasury. And we are a belligerent, Mr. Speaker. One million dollars a day this whole country, including Governments, Dominion and Provincial, municipalities, corporations and individuals were borrowing and importing, and we were deriving our revenue from duties upon these imports. If that is cut off and I have to replace it, does any one dare to rise in this House and say that that is not war taxation? What caused it? The war. The man in the street knows it