

cent; if it is \$3,000, 4 per cent; if it is 4,000 or \$5,000, 5 per cent—I just give these figures as illustrations; I do not mention them as the proper percentages—and carry them on right up to \$50,000, \$100,000, \$200,000, \$500,000 and \$1,000,000. Then when a man has ascertained what his income is it is a very easy matter to determine what amount of tax he should pay; for example in the case of \$3,000, it would be 3 per cent, after deducting \$2,000 for exemption. It seems to me that would make the matter perfectly simple and in that way you could get after the man with a large income just as well as you can now. Figuring out my income it would be about 5 per cent on the whole sum. If your income is so many thousand dollars it will be a simple matter to apply the percentage to it, and there is the result at once; it would not require a Philadelphia lawyer, or any other lawyer, to figure it out for you. As I say, it is of greatest importance that the matter be simplified. I would consolidate these four statutes and express the purpose in a few words so that anybody could understand it; as it is now nobody comprehends these statutes. Why should you not make the law as simple as possible so that every man might know how the sum he is required to pay is made up, and then be able to figure it out himself and see if the amount asked for is right and verify it? Personally I am in favour of there being no exemptions whatever, except perhaps where incomes are less than \$500, and for two reasons. I have previously suggested that a man whose income is \$500 should be required to pay one-quarter of 1 per cent, which would be \$1.25. That man has to go right down into his pocket and get \$1.25. He realizes that his country is heavily in debt and that the income tax has been imposed for relieving the country, at least partially, of that debt. The payment of such a tax would exert an educative influence on that man. If the income is \$1,000, I would have the tax on one-half of 1 per cent which would be \$5 a year; if \$1,500, so much tax; if \$2,000, so much more. I am not arguing for a large sum to be collected on small incomes, but the tax should be so levied that every man who votes pays something on account of our national debt. It would also have a wholesome influence upon those who determine the expenditure of these moneys. The people are paying taxes now, but most of them do not know it. The wholesale man pays the customs duty at the border, and the consumer has to pay that duty, but he does not realize the fact. If he had to go down in

his pocket for every dollar of taxes that he pays indirectly he would realize that he was paying a heavy amount of taxation, with the result that he would watch closely where that money went, and in that way I think it would have a wholesome effect on those who determined the expenditures here. I am sure the Minister of Finance would be very glad to simplify the matter so that every man would know exactly how the amount of taxation required from him is arrived at, and I hope he will see his way clear to put my suggestion into effect.

I repeat that to require a man to send in a cheque for a portion of his income tax when making his return will quadruple the work of the Finance Department, for I do not think that one man in ten will be able to figure out the correct amount to be remitted.

Mr. McKENZIE: I fully concur in the observation of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) that the present law is very complicated. I do not know whether I am getting a better or a worse lawyer as I grow older, but I devoted all the morning to a study of these statutes, and, like my hon. friend, at half-past one I gave up the task in despair, for I found it hopeless to make any sense out of the original Acts and the many amendments thereto. For instance, the amendments of 1917 and 1919 are very complicated indeed, and I am thoroughly in accord with my hon. friend's suggestion that the four statutes should be simplified and consolidated so that all who run may read what are their tax obligations.

We thought we were fighting in the great war not only to safeguard the rights handed down to us by our ancestors, but to acquire the further rights of advanced civilization. I know there was a time in British history when a man was hanged for stealing a sheep, but I never heard of his being shot on the spot. Therefore I am surprised that a distinguished statesman like my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), after the war is over, should propound the policy that any man who will not pay up the last half-penny under these complicated statutes—which ordinary lawyers cannot make out—should be shot on the spot; and I am further surprised to find the Minister of Finance bow his assent to the observations of the hon. member for Red Deer. I have no doubt that the minister made this mental note: Well, thank fortune, although the hon. member for Red Deer and I do not agree upon all things, there is at least one thing upon which we agree, that if any man under one of these complicated statutes