levy such taxes that the individual is left without enough income to discharge his family obligations.

Present day personal income tax is much too high; the basic exemption should be changed to guarantee a married couple a minimum tax free income of $5,000.

To the current price of building materials are added a federal tax of 11 per cent and a provincial tax of 8 per cent. How is it possible, then, for the small wage earner to have a house of his own? Furthermore, the government has allowed interest rates to increase, alleging as a pretext that lending institutions would not lend money at more reasonable rates of interest.

I blame the government for giving in to banking institutions. But in order to realize that those in control of money and credit are the masters of our lives one only has to look at the 1969-70 budget. It can be noted that the item relating to the public debt shows an increase of over 150 million dollars for servicing the public debt, to such an extent that we are paying $1,604,200,000 in interest alone.

The ordinary factory worker has a five-day week and is paid for 40 hours of work. However, those who are in a position to control money and credit and to draw interests are being paid, not for 40 hours of work but for 365 days a year and 24 hours a day. Mr. Speaker, therein lies the difference between consideration given to capital and labour.

Whenever big financial interests submit requests to the government, it cannot say no. But when requests come from the little man, such as workers or farmers, the government does not hesitate to refuse. This has been evidenced when some bills were considered by the house during the present session.

Therefore, I urge the government to seriously consider, without delay, a better distribution of personal and corporation income tax in order to be more equitable in this field. It is time families were ensured of an adequate income to enable them to obtain food and clothing, to have the necessary medical care and to receive education without having to depend always on welfare associations which are very costly for the community.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I will be told there are a great many pieces of legislation for the benefit of families and one of these deals with housing. I agree with that, but how could a worker whose income over $2,000 is subjected to taxes, and considering the 9 and 10 per cent interest rates, build his own home?

National production of a country is not aimed solely at increasing more and more the wealth of a few citizens, but rather at ensuring the well-being of its population as a whole. Society cannot call itself Christian if its working class is condemned to unemployment during periods of artificial economic crises or to a considerable decrease in income in case of illness or accident.

Society must try to provide its members with a sufficient income to meet the requirements of a decent standard of living. And it is at this point that comes into the picture the second means for giving some assistance to the head of family who has used up every other means to attain a decent life. The state must then fill the gap by drawing from the joint capital this citizen's work has built up, because he has a right, like everybody else, to benefit from it. The state must then make up the difference by insuring a supplementary income, since it is in a position to do so. And the best proof of it is that our granaries, our stores and our warehouses are overflowing with products.

So, Mr. Speaker, why take an antisocial attitude and deprive a portion of the population of things which are essential in life, at a time when there is such a high rate of unemployment.

What would you think of a father who would tell his children at the family table: Eat your soup and just one potato, nothing more, because, even if the cellar is jam-packed, we are faced with a technological problem: there is no staircase leading to it.

Mr. Speaker, more generous family allowances should be added to the income of the family head and this is possible thanks to the progress of science.

I would like hon. members to consider, as I do, what the Minister of Finance said in his budget speech on October 22, 1968.

If you consider tables 1 and 2, you will see that personal income tax in the financial year 1967-68 amounted to $3,650 million and that corporation income tax amounted to $1,821 million, that is $1,829 million less for corporations than for individuals. However, in 1968-69 the difference will be even greater, as personal income tax will give the federal government the fair amount of $4,190 million against $2,210 million from corporation income tax, or a gap of $1,980 million. Whereas