

Income Tax Act

guaranteed an annual income of \$1,500 when they are single and \$2,500 when they are married.

A married man with one child would get a basic exemption of \$2,750; with two children, \$3,000; with four children, \$3,250; with five children, \$3,750 and with six, a maximum of \$4,000 as guaranteed annual income or social security.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the people will be told, as I said on the national TV network: If an individual finds a job of \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year, he should accept it, because it would not reduce his social security allowance, since it would be guaranteed. We would all receive it: the poor, the less poor, the more or less rich, everybody. We would all have that guarantee, regardless of our income.

We would see the unemployed—there are some 500,000 in Canada at the present time—look for a job and their salary would be added to the social security guaranteed to all. A person earning \$10,000 would still receive his \$3,000 in social security.

It is the opposite at the present time. Nowadays a man drawing welfare allowances keeps away from work. Even prostitutes in Montreal draw welfare payments on top of their earnings or whatever salary they may get from various firms.

Mr. Chairman, the present system of social welfare is an incitement to laziness and dishonesty. We ought to replace it with a system of social security which would foster honesty, work and personal initiative in every Canadian citizen.

This is not understood yet. We hear people make fun of our proposals. The other night, I heard the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) say that this would cost \$18 billion. It will soon cost more than that to cope with revolutions which are being organized throughout Canada. Then members on the government side or members of the opposition will feel sorry and say: We were not courageous enough to act while there was still time left.

It is being said today that the silent majority does not move. Now, the silent majority begins here in this House where people do not have the courage to rise, where people laugh at those who offer concrete solutions, solutions that appeal to the intelligence of man, instead of the intelligence of the chap who will sell his vote at the next election for a small amount of social welfare.

Mr. Chairman, sections 109 and 110 will not change Canada's economic situation. The other day, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) announced a 3 per cent reduction in personal income tax. For the Canadian who has to pay \$300 in taxes, this will mean a reduction of \$9 for a year or 75 cents per month. If he has to pay \$200 per year, the reduction will be \$6, or 50 cents per month. And Liberal members will say: We have been generous to the people of Canada.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caouette: That is what I call a stupid person! I see a Liberal member applauding. He does not know why he is applauding, but he applauds. He thinks this is funny; he sits on the Liberal side of the House.

Mr. Chairman, they may laugh, they may take our suggestions lightly, but things will happen before long in

[Mr. Caouette.]

Canada—we have already experienced a few—exactly as they have happened in communist and socialist countries, because the government will not have had the guts to take position and act at the right time. We are afraid of making decisions. Again recently, we have been scared to make decisions as a free people, as free citizens.

Last night—and this has nothing to do with tax exemption in Canada—Communist China was admitted in the United Nations. Do we know that China became communist because of terrorists, bandits and murderers? And they are recognized in the United Nations while the Canadian army is called in to fight a dozen FLQ members or people planting bombs in Montreal. The Prime Minister of Canada is ready to roll out the red carpet for those people's entry into the United Nations Organization.

An hon. Member: Yes indeed!

Mr. Caouette: When they are raising Cain in Montreal, those people are called bad lots.

I see the Chairman rising, which would indicate that I am straying from the subject, to which I shall therefore return immediately.

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Chairman: It did occur to the Chair that the hon. member might have been somewhat irrelevant in the latter stages of his remarks, but in any event I rose to advise him that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Chairman: Order, please. Of course, the hon. member may continue if there is unanimous consent of the committee.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: There is no such consent. Is the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka rising on a point of order?

Mr. Aiken: No, I am rising to speak, Mr. Chairman. I was quite prepared to permit the hon. member for Témiscamingue to continue but I understand he has not been given consent. I would yield to him at this point so that he may continue.

Some hon. Members: Encore!

[*Translation*]

Some hon. Members: More.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman—

An hon. Member: Democracy at work.

Mr. Caouette: —I thank my good friend of the Progressive Conservative party for having suggested that I continue my comments, but I shall not take advantage of this courtesy.

I congratulate the Conservative member from I do not know what riding.

An hon. Member: Parry Sound-Muskoka.