

Income Tax Act

\$100 to become an owner he is immediately taxed and overtaxed while big capitalists are still protected.

In fact, I made a study on the protection given to big capitalists today. Half a century ago, for example, big capitalists paid roughly 70 per cent of taxes in Canada while small taxpayers paid 30 per cent. Today, it is quite the opposite. Small taxpayers pay 72 per cent of Canada's taxes and capitalists whose income has increased ten-fold in the past forty years pay only 28 per cent. That gives you an idea of the protection they have been getting over the years.

Well, I feel there could be a debate about amounts involved in the motion but, contrary to the opinion expressed by the previous speaker that it would not help housing, I believe it would indeed help housing tremendously. Personally, I am interested in building low cost housing because of my savings on interest. In fact, I gain two-thirds of maintenance and interest on mortgages, otherwise on the money I invested to pay for those rents.

It can clearly be seen how interesting that is for those who lend money on a large scale, and how well protected they are. Major money-lenders are allowed to benefit by deductions of two-thirds, which is not at all the case for small home owners since the second part of the motion calls for exemption on mortgage interest. I have always wondered why so few members were interested in the mortgage interest paid by the small owner.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that the time allowed for my speech has expired. In closing, I would like to say that the government should introduce legislation so that we could discuss it in more detail, for it is a problem of interest for the majority in this country, and I think that all small owners would be glad if the government were to present such a bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the Chair until eight p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CRIMINAL CODE

REINSTATEMENT OF LAW RELATING TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT THAT EXISTED PRIOR TO DECEMBER 30, 1972

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-2, to amend the Criminal Code, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, at five o'clock I was just saying that in the last few years espe-

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

cially, our laws have been greatly relaxed. Looking back, we find that in 1967 capital punishment was abolished for five years. Now it is intended to extend this measure, but we are well aware that the government wants to abolish capital punishment completely.

It is also wished to liberalize the use of drugs, to make abortion completely free. Contraceptives have been legalized. Homosexuality has been legalized, and according to a study of the cost of prostitution in Montreal, a study that was requested by the former Solicitor General, it will probably be proposed before long to liberalize prostitution so that prostitutes may contribute to the tax revenue.

Mr. Speaker, when one considers this whole range of abolitions, one wonders where all this will lead us. One wonders whether the Liberal party does not take too seriously the name which makes it different from other political parties.

In an article published by a student of Sir George Williams University, Mr. Robert Rochon, two or three years ago in *La Presse*, one could read the following remarks, and I quote:

● (2010)

What does society exactly mean both for the layman and the intellectual, in concrete terms? Therefore, it is by this last question that I answer, I believe, to the first one, namely: "That value, what is it?"

A society is a group of people gathered in one community by nature, by laws or by a contract. It is a moral union of intelligent beings, grouped in a stable and efficient manner to achieve a purpose that is known to and desired by everyone. This moral union of intelligent beings consists of three things essential to the achievement of that purpose:

- 1) Unity with regard to a purpose that is known to and desired by everyone
- 2) Unity of will to achieve that purpose
- 3) Co-ordination of appropriate means to achieve that purpose, WHENCE the need for an authority obeyed by everyone.

Relations of the members of the social "body" as such are relations that are determined by the purpose of society and governed by the latter. Therefore, this group of men or intelligent beings is a social fact which consists mainly of the behaviour of the subjects. Whence the necessity of conforming to principles, customs and moral or legal rules.

Mr. Speaker, this definition of society seems clear enough to me; let me repeat the three main elements that Mr. Rochon lists:

- 1) Unity with regard to a purpose that is known to and desired by everyone.
- 2) Unity of will to achieve that purpose.
- 3) Co-ordination of appropriate means to achieve that purpose, WHENCE the need for an authority obeyed by everyone.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that we come together and make laws to protect ourselves, and we must accept those laws. But we become aware that one element of the population, certain members of our society refuse the laws which have been set up by and for it. These people disregard the essential principles for achieving the society we desire.

In the book "Law and Order in Canadian Democracy", published by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, we read on page 9:

The existence and enforcement of "law" in a free country like Canada presupposes "order" as a necessary corollary. Where there