

Taxation Reform

made this debate wide open when he spoke about the contents of his white paper. Since he spoke, everybody else is entitled to do so.

In summary I say, first, that this is the wrong kind of taxation system for this country. This tax proposal will deter people from accumulating capital. It will load the requirement for tax revenue on the back of the tax-paying public whom we do not want to overload. They are people between the ages of 30 and 60. Ask the trust companies and the life insurance companies which groups of people in this country save the most, and you will find that persons between the age of 25 and 30, those who are newly married and so forth, have more than enough to do to make the first payments on a home, to buy a car and to cover all the expenses of starting a family. They are not the savers. But people from the age of 30 all the way up to 60 are the ones who save most. After the age of 60, the incentive to economize tapers off considerably.

The people who will be burdened with the additional tax, and some of it is vicious in the accelerating rate of its increase, are earning between \$9,000 and \$25,000. What is so sacrosanct today about earning \$25,000? All sorts of people in the government service earn this amount. Teachers, high school principals, municipal officials and provincial officials earn about that amount. Are they to be considered in the wealthy class? Are those who earn between \$12,000 and \$13,000 to be considered in the wealthy class, as the minister said? Under agreements signed a few weeks ago, carpenters, plumbers and electricians will be earning more than \$12,000 or \$13,000, not including overtime. When they earn \$7 an hour, that is what it comes to on a yearly basis. They are now in the wealthy class. I ask the minister to speak to high school teachers who in some cases are now receiving a fairly decent salary of \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year. He should listen to their complaints.

I say that this white paper demands the most exacting examination. The minister has already indicated a number of areas that are giving him concern. He must be suffering from shellshock resulting from the attacks on the white paper which have come to him in a steady flow of letters. He should not get involved in intemperate attacks, such as the one he indulged in yesterday, against the presidents of two or three banks of this country and some others who have been critical. Have they not the right to criticize? The minister assumes the right to criticize any and every person. They have that right also. What is

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

wrong with businessmen attacking the white paper? I could almost say it is petty-mindedness to jump on the backs of people who make sincere criticisms of the white paper. I would like to see the white paper go to committee. I do not want it to go to the finance committee of this House; it should go to a joint committee.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? The hon. member argued that this white paper should go to a joint committee for consideration. Whether or not this should be done, I am sure the hon. gentleman is aware that it is being considered by the Senate committee. I am not supposed to mention the Senate in the House, for some reason or other; I am supposed to say "the other place". However, the fact is that that committee is sitting at present and is investigating this matter. Would the hon. member tell us how he thinks the Senate can disband that committee, in light of the fact that the Government Leader of the Senate is determined to show the House that he has a better committee? In fact, he has already offered to the chairman of the House of Commons committee the benefit of all the effort and research of the Senate committee. If the government is to follow the hon. member's suggestion, we will have two committees—the Senate committee and a joint committee. How does the hon. member think the Senate will disband their committee?

● (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I know that the die is now cast, but I am criticizing the decision that was made. The decision was made when the Government House Leader in the other place laid out the business. The reference was to be to the Senate Committee on Banking and Commerce, the same as when this item was posted on our Order Paper many weeks ago.

Mr. Otto: That is yesterday's apples.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Whether they are or not, I can still criticize them.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and to give greater clarity, you will recall that a special order of the House was made for this debate several weeks ago, saying that the Standing Orders would be changed for this debate so that hon. members would speak for a maximum of 20 minutes. Some 21 members, including the