

The Budget—Mr. Bourget

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention certain examples the Minister of Finance gave us in order to give the people an idea of the increase or the reduction in taxes—mostly an increase—which could be expected, I quote from page 2417 of *Hansard* for April 9:

For purposes of comparison, let us consider the position of a typical married man who is the father of two children of family allowance age.

At an income level of \$3,000 a year, under the new rates this man will pay a total of income tax and social security contribution of \$56, an increase of \$4 from the 1958 level. He will, however, be paying \$34 less—

And I wish to stress this part of his remarks, Mr. Speaker.

He will, however, be paying \$34 less than he paid before the reductions were introduced in 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister of Finance wanted the people to believe that, as a result of the new tax increases, the taxpayers would pay even less taxes in 1959 than they used to pay under the Liberal administration in 1957. However, in saying that the Canadians, even after the tax increase, would pay \$34 less, he forgot to add other taxes—

Mr. Asselin: Which ones?

Mr. Bourget: Which ones? Here they are: the excise tax, the tax on cigarettes—

Mr. Asselin: Luxury.

Mr. Bourget: Luxury taxes! When you spoke of taxes during the 1957 and 1958 election, you did not talk about luxury taxes and yet, you boasted about abolishing taxes without mentioning any increase. That is what you were talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be disturbed by the interruptions of my good friend from Charlevoix. Nevertheless, I would like to show that as a result of the tax increases, taxpayers will pay more taxes in 1959 than in 1957, and I explain. We must not forget to add here the increase in the tax on cigarettes, and I want to be conservative—not for long, however—

Mr. Denis: Shame!

Mr. Bourget: —and say that from now on, if a man buys a package of cigarettes every day, he will pay 4 cents more a day, or close to \$15 in a year.

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Bourget: If the hon. member would let me—

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The government has not increased the price of cigarettes by 4 cents a package. The companies have taken advantage of the tax increase to raise the price by 4 cents, and the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Bourget) should be more accurate in his statements.

Mr. Habel: Why don't you say something about Mr. Duplessis' tax?

Mr. Pigeon: We are not concerned here with provincial politics.

Mr. Bourget: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the brilliant member for Joliette-l'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) I would ask him to read over what I have quoted a moment ago, to read over the speech made by the Minister of Finance who, when he was in the opposition, spoke of hidden taxes. Just read over what he said, as recorded in the 1954 *Hansard*.

An hon. Member: He cannot do that, since he is spending his time preparing speeches.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The former government levied taxes to subsidize the public, to please the Americans.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, there are too many members speaking at the same time at present. I believe it would be preferable for hon. members to speak just one at a time. An hon. member has risen on a point of order and I would ask the house to allow him to repeat what he said. It rests with the Speaker to determine if the point of order is justified or not. For the time being, I suggest that the hon. members allow the hon. member for Levis to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. Bourget: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to prove that we Canadians are going to pay more taxes in 1959 than in 1957.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member for Levis. In fact, I allowed him to speak and he was quite justified in proceeding with his observations. But, so that we may proceed in an orderly fashion, I think that the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm had already risen on a point of order. Therefore,