

The Address—Mr. Boivin

1871 and 1881 the number of immigrants was doubled but only one out of five remained in Canada. Between 1881 and 1891 the immigration became two and a half times as intense but only one-ninth of the immigrants remained in this country. Between 1891 and 1901 six out of ten immigrants left Canada. During the most intense immigration period, 1,848,000 foreigners were admitted to Canada but the emigration was about one million. From 1921 to 1931 we received one and a half million new citizens but we lost one and a quarter million. During the whole period between 1851 and 1931 we have lost 6,110,000 persons who left for the United States, 1,740,000 of whom were born in this country and 4,370,000 were immigrants who had found it impossible to establish themselves in our economic life. Not for a single moment during the last 90 years, except for the temporary requirements of the war, has Canada been affected by a shortage of manpower. We have no business to bring here large numbers of immigrants before we have reasonably insured full employment and social security to our own people, whatever their racial origin may be—

And further on the same lecturer said this:

New immigrants should not be chosen exclusively among the British people.

He does not share the views of the leader of the opposition.

Our national revenue has reached a higher level this year and consequently the remarks made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) in his last budget speech are still more justified and truthful. I recall that he said:

This year I can again report, so far as Canada is concerned, an unprecedented rate of economic activity and a new record of progress in our government accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I rejoiced with the Minister of Finance when I heard on different occasions this year that we would again have an unexpected surplus nearly as substantial as that of last year, if not greater. The news item which appeared but a few months ago announcing that we would have to increase our expenses for national defence was accepted without any recrimination throughout the country because the people understood our government's attitude.

Mr. Speaker, with such a surplus this year, I hope the Minister of Finance will remember the words he spoke on April 29, 1947 and which are to be found at page 2554 of *Hansard* of that year. So that he may not forget them, I will take the liberty of quoting him:

I am consequently proposing to make a substantial reduction in taxation in this budget. Moreover, I am proposing to concentrate this reduction almost entirely in the field of personal income tax. This is the tax that at present levels is proving so unpopular and is causing difficulty. To overcome the situation which I have described a substantial reduction is necessary.

We trust therefore that the Minister of Finance, faithful to his word, will increase the tax exemptions requested more than once, by myself, and many other members. We all

[Mr. Boivin.]

know that the Minister of Finance was not invested with his responsibilities to please the people nor to apply only those regulations which are agreeable to the people. We know that his chief responsibility is to ensure a fair proportion between revenues and expenses. I hope his task will prove less ungrateful this year. I do not consider I have asked for anything unreasonable when in my speech on May 22, 1947 I suggested the exemption should be from \$1,200 to \$2,000. At that time, I submitted statistics to show that a single person earning \$1,200 was short \$99 at the end of the year and that a head of family with two dependent children and earning \$2,000 had a deficit of \$215.

We must unfortunately recognize the fact that since 1947 the cost of living has considerably increased and if I were to compute again my figures in accordance with the present cost of living, the deficit for each would be twice or even three times as high. The head of family has had to cope with an increased rent, the power companies do not allow discounts, the price of clothing has considerably increased, and a minimum of \$3 a day for food would be absurd. For these reasons, I have to ask more this year and request on behalf of my constituents, an exemption of at least \$1,500 for a single person, and \$2,500 for a married man, with \$200 exemption for each child in receipt of family allowances and \$400 for the other children. Moreover, all children should be considered as dependents as long as they attend school. Everyone knows that classical studies and a university course cost the parents more money. I also ask that income tax deductions at the source, inaugurated in September 1942 and which still affect the average wage earner, be abolished.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that you could be present at a distribution of pay envelopes in any industry. You would then realize the feelings of the average workers when they receive their money. After deductions for income tax, unemployment insurance and retirement fund, the amount actually received is far less than they really earned and should be getting.

Storekeepers, dealers, manufacturers and professional men submit their report four months after the end of the year. In my opinion, it would be only fair to treat the average wage earners on the same footing.

The unemployment insurance commission should pay benefits as of the date the contributor ceased to work because those people need the money, having used up all their savings owing to the rise in the cost of living and to the heavy taxes they have been forced to pay.