

*Succession Duty Act*

Mr. ILSLEY: I am thinking about a case where it is paid after the death by the executor. In that event it would be a debt of the estate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes.

Mr. ILSLEY: If reimbursement were not possible.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It could be deducted as a debt?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, if reimbursement were not possible.

Mr. JACKMAN: What troubled me was paragraph (a). It says that an allowance shall not be made for a debt incurred where no consideration passed. Then the consideration is outlined rather specifically. If you endorse a note for a friend, you can hardly say you get "money's worth," which is the expression used in the paragraph. Neither would that be true if you endorsed a note for a son.

Mr. ILSLEY: Money's worth was obtained from the bank.

Mr. JACKMAN: But not by the deceased.

Mr. ILSLEY: That does not matter. That would be between the guarantor and the bank. The guarantor would owe the bank the money.

Mr. JACKMAN: But the paragraph specifically states "money's worth wholly for the deceased's own use and benefit."

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Before the title carries, I should like to make one observation. I am rather in accord with this type of taxation, first because we need the money. We must go where the money is, and we must get it. Any move the government makes toward getting money to help prosecute the war effort will receive the support of a good many of us from all sides of the chamber. I could not sit still and take the little lecture from the hon. member for Temiscouata with regard to those of us who sit on this side of the house, without saying something.

This particular item of taxation is one which worries those of us here perhaps less than many other forms of taxation in other bills which will come before us.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. ILSLEY moved the third reading of the bill.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I believe I represent, on the question of over-government and overtaxation, a large body of public opinion in this country. I am not trying to speak for the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), or the opposition, but I can speak for myself. I believe that in connection with this bill it is not patriotic to remain silent, and particularly at a time like this. Everybody wants to help win the war; nothing else matters in Canada but the winning of the war.

I deeply sympathize with the two ministers in charge of this bill, and the officials associated with them. They have a tiresome, wearisome and thankless job. There is, however, a large body of public opinion in Canada, a body of honest workers and toilers who have toiled all their lives to amass only a little property. We have in Canada been overgoverned by dominion, provincial and municipal governments with many taxes on the same property. We have not noticed how the right to possess property has been taken away from people in Canada by measures of taxation such as the one before the house.

In the early days of this country, in the days of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the rest of them, everybody owned a little property. A man would own a store, a small garden, a mill, a horse and rig or a little farm, and he tried to be thrifty. In those days a man was encouraged to be thrifty. The people who came to Canada from England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales and many other countries in the early days were thrifty. The minister urged in his budget speech, and he is again urging in connection with the loan about to be made, that people should collect savings to help in the war. We have been slow to see how the right to possess private property, and the ownership of property have been taken away in Canada to-day. So much is that true that people have become proletarian. The direct result has been that very few people possess property to-day. It is the desire of all good citizens that the government shall prosecute the war to the end; that is all that counts. The government must collect large sums of money by taxation or borrowing. They need it. I am sorry, however, that in the budget, they have not tried to collect it on a fifty-fifty basis—fifty per cent from income and fifty per cent from capital. The manner in which it is being collected, with duplicate taxes of all kinds, is imposing a heavy burden on the thrifty people of Canada.

As I see it, these phantom excursions into the revenues of the provinces and the