

is found—if we are to bring in an income tax, we must bring in an income tax which really does what it is intended to do, namely, make those pay who can pay. Although it costs much more to live in Canada to-day than it formerly did, we must realize that the well-to-do man is getting far more money than he ever had before, and that those men who are getting more money on account of the war are getting it without very much greater exertion. If that be the fact, then they ought to be able to pay more, and they ought to be made to pay more. When one considers that after this tax is deducted, a man with an income of \$7,000 still retains \$6,820, a man with an income of \$10,000 retains \$9,640, a man with \$20,000 retains \$18,740, a man with \$30,000 retains \$27,540, a man with \$75,000 retains \$64,990, a man with \$100,000 retains \$85,240, and a man with \$200,000 retains \$156,240, surely no one will say that the sums that I have mentioned that are left to those men are not plenty, and more than enough, to keep them in affluent circumstances, no matter what their position may be. If we are really honestly intending to conscript wealth, or to take the well-to-do man's money in lieu of his blood, we should leave him with only enough to keep him in ordinary circumstances, and, even although we shall thus be depriving him of many luxuries, it is right that he should suffer at least some of the hardships that the man at the front is suffering in order to protect that wealth.

The Minister of Finance says: If you impose very severe taxation you will dry up the flow of contributions to the Patriotic and Red Cross Funds; or, in other words, if you touch the big man with the big income you stop the source of your Patriotic and Red Cross Fund subscriptions. No one knows so much about such subscriptions as the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), and this is what he said last night when this matter was being discussed. He did not argue that the big man was paying those subscriptions. He said:

All that we are pleading for is that the money which is subscribed and paid in 1917 by the comparatively small portion of our population who have an income of over \$3,000, and who therefore come under this tax, may be regarded as having been paid to the Government. Three-eighths of all the money we get comes from taxation; probably as much more comes from small subscribers, and perhaps one-quarter of all we get comes from the large subscribers who have incomes of \$3,000 and upwards, and who will therefore be hit by this tax.

So the hon. member for St. Antoine apparently does not take the same view as the Minister of Finance.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I did not say all.

Mr. PARDEE: I quite agree, but I think the minister will agree that he left the impression on the House, and intended to leave it, that the big contributor would not contribute to the Patriotic Fund if he was taxed any more severely under this measure; that was the logical inference from the minister's statement this afternoon. I repeat again—and I cannot repeat it too often or too vehemently—that in view of the figures set out in this Bill there is to my mind no conscription of wealth at all in this country; this is not a real income tax. The Finance Minister says: "We have the most heavily taxed country in the world." That may be, but if we are the most heavily taxed country in the world there is no reason why we should not be the most heavily taxed country in the world, because no country stands to lose more through this war than Canada. If we are to keep our men at the front, if money has to be raised to purchase the necessary supplies, where do the rich men get off, and where do the people of this country get off? Why should a man with an income of \$75,000, which is an enormous income, be allowed to keep \$64,990 in his pocket, after paying this tax? I am bound to say that to me that does not savour of conscription in the slightest degree. It imposes no hardship whatever on that man, except that when he comes to tot up his bank book at the end of the year, he has not got quite so much as he had, but still has more than any man has a right to have.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not believe there are many men in Canada who have an income of \$75,000. My hon. friend is overlooking the fact that most incomes of that amount will be incomes of companies. A business that a man might engage in as an individual or as a partner might yield that amount, but it would be in competition with joint stock companies having a similar amount of income. It is not like the income of an individual.

Mr. PARDEE: I will take my hon. friend's own statement. He says that most of them will be joint stock companies.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Most of them would, but there are other firms in competition with joint stock companies.

Mr. PARDEE: Why should not the joint stock companies pay?