

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But we are already supposed to have paid half the total for 1942.

Mr. ILSLEY: Then there is nothing more to pay.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But on account of not having any income tax forms many people do not know what they owe. They may not know until they get the forms. When will the forms be ready?

Mr. GIBSON: They will be ready after the house approves the changes brought about by the budget. We cannot issue them before the resolution is carried.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): How soon after the resolution is passed will they be ready?

Mr. GIBSON: The forms are set up, ready to be printed. We are awaiting confirmation by the house.

Mr. JACKMAN: What is the total tax debt of the Canadian public in respect of the year 1942, assuming the January 15 payment included in 1942? How much will be collected on 1942 account in 1943?

Mr. ILSLEY: I have not the figure, and I do not think anyone has. Is the hon. gentleman asking the amount that is still due assuming this proposal becomes law—after the fifty per cent forgiveness how much is still due?

Mr. JACKMAN: That is right.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think anyone has the figure.

Mr. DORION: In the application of the income tax the position of those who have many children to support should be taken into consideration. Speaking on the budget some weeks ago I expressed the view that the government should take more care of the heads of large families. I recalled that the essential elements that constitute the society which we are now fighting to safeguard are not adequately protected as regards the burden of taxation imposed upon them.

Not long ago we read in the newspapers that there was in some quarters discussion of a project for bringing into our country after the war immigrants from European countries. But there is no doubt that the best way to increase the Canadian population would be by raising children in Canadian families. Therefore the first duty of the government should be to protect in every possible way the

large families now existing, and also to encourage the people to have as many children as possible. This way of increasing our population would be without any doubt the surest way to have a sound and right-minded population. In view of this I believe the government, in the matter of taxation, should give protection to the heads of large families.

Referring to the revised table of tax deductions recently published by the Minister of National Revenue I should like to give one example of this deficiency in our Income War Tax Act. Taking an income of \$3,000 a year, that is to say a monthly amount of \$250, as shown at pages 26 and 27 of the revised table, one can readily see that for a single person without dependents the total monthly tax is \$84.25, or an annual tax of \$1,011. This leaves a balance of \$1,989. For a married person with four dependents the total monthly tax is \$35.80, or an annual tax of \$429.60, leaving a balance of \$2,570.40. According to these figures the married person with four dependents is entitled to only \$581 for the maintenance of his wife and his four children, that is to say, the difference between \$2,570.40 and \$1,989. Is there anyone who will contend that this is just and fair? The example I have just given is an illustration of the whole matter, because if you look at the revised table you can take any figure and compare the two classes of people I have just mentioned and see that it is the same all over. Therefore my contention is that married people with dependents, and especially those with four or more dependents, are not adequately protected but are penalized because they have too many children. The country needs large families, and it needs well brought up families. I suggest that to take \$429.60 per annum from a family consisting of father, mother and four children, with an income of \$3,000, is far from being a good way to get such families. We must not forget that besides the income tax there are many other taxes upon the citizens of one kind or another. Therefore it goes without saying that a man who has a wife and four children pays more taxes proportionately for the support of his family than a single person. In fact the burden of taxes is much heavier than the difference between the two figures just given.

I do not hesitate to declare that if the matter were submitted to expert economists they would report that something should be done to correct this situation for the benefit of the whole community. I submit that if our system of taxation continues to penalize those who have large families, the effect upon