## INCREASE IN TAX ALONE

(AMOUNTS ROUNDED TO NEAREST DOLLAR)

| Income | Single | Married | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No children | 2 children | 5 children | 8 children |
| $1,250 | 5 | −25 | − 6 | — | — |
| 1,500 | 30 | 34 | −10 | — | — |
| 2,000 | 101 | 56 | 47 | — | — |
| 2,500 | 151 | 126 | 102 | 30 | — |
| 3,000 | 202 | 184 | 119 | 122 | 17 |
| 4,000 | 319 | 289 | 218 | 237 | 210 |
| 5,000 | 396 | 378 | 327 | 269 | 372 |
| 7,500 | 570 | 555 | 517 | 430 | 438 |
| 10,000 | 712 | 682 | 636 | 542 | 420 |

Looking at this table, it will be seen that the single taxpayer with an income of $1,250 has had his tax increased by $5; the married man, without children, and with that same income, has had his tax decreased by $25; the married man with two children has had his tax decreased by $6. I admit that that is just a little out of line from what the proper principle would be, but slight departures are necessary in the application of the formula; that cannot be avoided. There is just one other difference in this whole table. The single taxpayer having an income of $1,500 has had his tax increased by $30, and the married taxpayer by $34: that is the second failure of the formula to get ideal results and, as hon. gentlemen will note, it is the last one. The married man with $1,500 and two children has had his tax decreased by $10. At $1,750 the increase for the single man is $58, for the married man without children it is $36, and for the married man with two children it is $5. At $2,000 the increase for the single man is $101, for the married man without children it is $56, and for the married man with two children it is $47. At $2,500 the increase for the single man is $151, for the married man without children it is $126, and for the married man with two children it is $102. At $3,000, the increase for the single man is $202, for the married man without children $184, and for the married man with two children, $119.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Just there: does not the single man with an income of $3,000 pay $1,064?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, I believe so.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How much did he pay on his 1941 income?

[Mr. Ilsley.]

Mr. ILSLEY: That is, including the compulsory savings. We do not know how much of that he will pay the government. He may not pay anything.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is the tax?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is $824.

Mr. SLAGHT: The minister is speaking of the increase as so-and-so; is that over last year?

Mr. ILSLEY: Over last year. The point I am trying to make is this. The argument has been that we have pooled these two categories and in some way have done an injustice to the married man; that we have narrowed the spread between the single man and the married man. That is not so. With the exception of the two instances which I gave, in every case we have widened the spread. We have increased the tax more on the single man than we have on the married man, and still more than on the married man with two children.

Mr. SLAGHT: Would not that depend upon whether you were pretty bad last year or not?

Mr. ILSLEY: Well, if it is an attack on last year's rates, that is another thing, but I thought it was an attack on this year's rates. Assuming that last year's rates gave a proper relationship between the single and the married man, we have done even better for the married man, and still better for the married man with children this year, on the lower categories. I will go along. At $4,000 the increase for the single man is $319; for the married man, $289; and for the married man with two children, $218. At $5,000 it is $396 for the single man, $378 for the married man, and $327 for the married man with two chil-