

with the reductions announced last year for 1947, they will relieve the people of Canada of a heavy burden. May I give a few examples.

We have already covered the fact that in 1948 a married man with two children of family allowance age will benefit by the sum of \$14 in family allowances over the tax he will pay. A married man with two children of family allowance age and earning \$3,000 in 1946 did not receive anything in family allowances and paid a tax of \$259, which means that he had to live on \$2,741. In 1948 he will receive \$144 in family allowances and pay \$230, thus being left with \$2,914, instead of \$2,741 in 1946. A married man with five children and earning an income of \$3,000 in 1946 did not receive any family allowances and paid a tax amounting to \$144.65. In 1947 his family allowances, calculated at the strict minimum of \$312, will exceed by \$106 his tax of \$206, and in 1948 it will exceed the tax of \$170 by \$142; which means that his net position or, if you prefer, the amount he will have at his disposal in 1948, will be \$3,142 when his earned income is \$3,000. When a married man with two children, and earning \$2,500 a year, has at his disposal in 1948, thanks to the combined effect of income tax reductions and family allowances, an amount of \$2,514 and a married man with five children, and earning \$3,000 has \$3,142, we can say that almost all taxpayers with families not only will not have their incomes cut by direct taxation but also will receive money from the government in excess of earned income to help them raise their families.

The ultimate importance lies in the amount of money at the disposal of married persons to help them raise their families. When the taxpayers realize up to what levels of income the amount of family allowance receipts will offset income tax payments, they will admit, I am convinced, that the budget presented by the Minister of Finance is truly a relief for the Canadian family.

For a one-child family it is \$2,100; for two children, \$2,560; for three children, \$3,030; and for four children, \$3,500; and so up. However, I sincerely deplore the fact that it has not been possible for the Minister of Finance to give some relief to taxpayers with incomes below \$5,000 who have children of over twenty-one years of age attending college or university. The father of a large family wishing to complete the education of his children cannot attain the objective to which he has devoted his life. When he wants to give his children the best heritage possible the law comes along and takes away from him the very money he needs to further their education.

I wonder if it would not be possible at this time to reconsider the resolution and bring in an amendment to the clauses dealing with exemptions, by which amendment the age would be altered from twenty-one to twenty-five for children attending college or university. It may be argued that this would be an exemption in favour of the rich. No, Mr. Speaker. The exemption I am asking for is in favour of the father in the lower income groups, the so-called middle class, who works all his life to give his children the chance to be more valuable assets to their country. Let us not forget that it would mean only an insignificant loss in revenue.

Before resuming my seat, I should like to deal with a criticism most often heard against the budget. There is a strong feeling expressed in this house by the hon. member for Rose-town-Biggan, the hon. member for Peace River and others that the exemptions of \$750 for single persons and \$1,500 for married persons should have been raised to \$1,000 and \$2,000 respectively. I myself regret that it has not been possible to do something in that direction at this time.

An hon. MEMBER: Why was it not done?

Mr. LESAGE: I will tell you in a few moments.

I believe that an income of \$750 is not enough to provide the necessities of life to a single person living in a city or town. On the other hand, there are three main arguments against an increase in the exemption at this time, and they warrant thorough consideration. First, there is the fact mentioned by the Minister of Finance that the exemption level as established last year, taking effect on January 1 of this year, exempts completely from tax more than half the people earning incomes in Canada. I know I shall hear my hon. friends of the C.C.F. say that is because the standard of living in Canada is too low, but we have to take the facts as they are.

Mr. GILLIS: But it is still too low.

Mr. LESAGE: I think something should be done to increase the standard of living, not only by this government but by the provincial governments.

Mr. GILLIS: That is right.

Mr. LESAGE: Second, we should not forget that the exemptions in Canada are higher than in Australia, New Zealand, Britain and the United States.

Mr. GILLIS: There is no social security in this country.

Mr. LESAGE: You say there is no social security?