Hon. Mr. EULER: Well, we do not.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I think if we are patient enough Mr. Gavsie and Dr. Eaton can assist us.

Hon. Mr. MORAUD: The trouble is our patience cannot last more than one day—then the session is over.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: It is quite evident that this proposed legislation is very complicated. Then is it fair to the ordinary citizen of Canada to put into effect a portion of the income tax which he does not understand? Is it fair to ask the ordinary, average Canadian citizen, should he have a little property or become involved in any of the provisions of sections 7 and 8, to go to some expert and pay him real money before he can make out his income tax returns?

We have around this table some of the most able corporation lawyers in Canada, and they do not appear to understand this legislation.

May I ask a question: Suppose I am in the process of making out my income tax return, and become involved in some of these complicated provisions, may I go to the Inspector of Income Tax at Kingston, for instance, and ask him to clarify the matter and help me make out my return, or would I have to go to a tax expert and pay him?

Mr. GAVSIE: You could certainly go to the Inspector at Kingston, and ask him any questions you wanted to know. I don't know whether it is proper for me to say anything while this discussion is going on—

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Say what you like.

Mr. GAVSIE: There are five pages of writing in this bill, or perhaps more, and in excess of three-quarters of it relates to specific rules that do not affect the ordinary taxpayer. Take, for instance, an ordinary taxpayer who runs, let us say, a newspaper.

Hon. Mr. NICOL: No ordinary taxpayer runs a newspaper.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: A boot and shoe store.

Mr. GAVSIE: Yes, a boot and shoe store. He has fixtures in the store, may own the building and perhaps has an automobile. All he has to do is take one sheet of paper and divide it into three parts. He takes the building which, we will say, he has owned since 1935, and on which depreciation has been taken up to date; he has a record of that. Say he paid $10,000 for the building when he bought it, and he has taken depreciation up to 1949 at 2½ per cent—that would be 30 per cent. Then the 1949 cost of the building would be $7,000. He started this business in 1935. His fixtures cost him $15,000. He has been depreciating them at 10 per cent. He has taken all depreciation, so we are not concerned with any recapture or anything else. I am making this, of course, over-simple. He may have bought things in the meantime. Let me deal with a simple case. In 1945 he bought an automobile, or a truck—because if he had bought it in 1935 there would not be much left to it. It cost him $1,500.

Hon. Mr. NICOL: Where did he buy it?

Mr. GAVSIE: Well, say General Motors. Let us say that the 1949 cost of that is written down to $700. Well, now, what does he do in 1949? There is to be issued a regulation giving the rates. I cannot forecast what that will be. But he looks at the rate table and he says, "My building has a 1949 value of $7,000. I take 5 per cent of that, that is $350 for the building. The fixtures have been fully written off; there is no depreciation for this year on the fixtures. My automobile, $700, the rate for that is, say—20 per cent; I take $140 for depreciation on that. My depreciation for this year is $490." So in making up his income tax return he has got $490. Now he comes to 1950. He has taken $350 as his depreciation for 1949. $7,000 was his 1949 cost. That gives him $6,650. Now, for 1950 he takes 15 per cent, if that is the rate, of $6,650, and that will