

First, does it fall within the description of taxation allowed by Class 2 of Section 92 of the Federation Act, viz., "Direct taxation within the province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes"? Secondly, if it does, are we compelled by anything in Section 91 or in the other parts of the Act, so to cut down the full meaning of the words of Section 92 that they shall not cover this tax?

First, is the tax a direct tax? For the argument of this question the opinions of a great many writers on political economy have been cited, and it is quite proper, or rather necessary, to have careful regard to such opinions, as has been said in previous cases before this Board. But it must not be forgotten that the question is a legal one, viz., what the words mean, as used in this statute; whereas the economists are always seeking to trace the effect of taxation throughout the community, and are apt to use the words "direct," and "indirect," according as they find that the burden of a tax abides more or less with the person who first pays it. This distinction is illustrated very clearly by the quotations from a very able and clear thinker, the late Mr. Fawcett, who, after giving his tests of direct and indirect taxation, makes remarks to the effect that a tax may be made direct or indirect by the position of the taxpayers or by private bargains about its payment. Doubtless, such remarks have their value in an economical discussion. Probably it is true of every indirect tax that some persons are both the first and the final payers of it; and of every direct tax that it affects persons other than the first payers; and the excellence of an economist's definition will be measured by the accuracy with which it contemplates and embraces every incident of the thing defined. But that very excellence impairs its value for the purposes of the lawyer. The Legislature cannot possibly have meant to give a power of taxation valid or invalid according to its actual results in particular cases. It must have contemplated some tangible dividing line referable to and ascertainable by the general tendencies of the tax and the common understanding of men as to those tendencies.

After some consideration, Mr. Kerr chose the definition of John Stuart Mill as the one he would prefer to abide by. That definition is as follows:—

"Taxes are either *direct* or *indirect*. A *direct tax* is one which is demanded from the very persons who it is intended or desired should pay it. *Indirect taxes* are those which are demanded from one person in the expectation and intention that he shall indemnify himself at the expense of another; such are the *excise* or *customs*."

"The producer or importer of a commodity is called upon to pay a tax on it, not with the intention to levy a peculiar contribution upon him, but to tax through him the consumers of the commodity, from whom it is supposed that he will recover the amount by means of an advance in price."

It is said that Mills adds a term,—that to be strictly direct a tax must be general; and this condition was much pressed at the bar. Their Lordships have not thought it necessary to examine Mill's works for the purpose of ascertaining precisely what he does say on this point; nor would they presume to say whether for economical purposes such a condition is sound or unsound; but they have no hesitation in rejecting it for legal purposes. It would deny the character of a direct tax to the income tax of this country, which is always spoken of as such, and is generally looked upon as a direct tax of the most obvious kind; and it would run counter to the common understanding of men on this subject, which is one main clue to the meaning of the Legislature.

Their Lordships then take Mill's definition above quoted as a fair basis for testing the character of the tax in question, not only because it is chosen by the appellant's counsel, nor only because it is that of an eminent writer, nor with the intention that it should be considered a binding legal definition, but because it seems to them to embody with sufficient accuracy for this purpose an understanding of the most obvious *indicia* of direct and indirect taxation, which is a common understanding, and is likely to have been present to the minds of those who passed the Federation Act.