

## Division

## NAYS

## Messrs:

Anderson	LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Badanai	Lefebvre
Barrett	Legault
Basford	Lessard
Béchar	(Lac-Saint-Jean)
Benson	Lind
Blair	Macdonald (Rosedale)
Blouin	MacEachen
Borrie	MacGuigan
Buchanan	Mackasey
Caccia	McIlraith
Cadieux (Labelle)	McNulty
Chappell	Mahoney
Chrétien	Marceau
Clermont	Marchand (Langelier)
Cobbe	Marchand (Kamloops- Cariboo)
Comtois	Mongrain
Côté (Richelieu)	Munro
Côté (Longueuil)	Murphy
Cullen	O'Connell
Cyr	Olson
Danson	Orange
Davis	Osler
Deachman	Otto
Douglas (Assiniboia)	Ouellet
Drury	Pelletier
Dubé	Penner
Duquet	Pepin
Énard	Perrault
Forget	Pilon
Francis	Prud'homme
Gendron	Richard
Gervais	Richardson
Gibson	Roberts
Gillespie	Robinson
Givens	Roy (Timmins)
Goode	Ryan
Gray	Serré
Greene	Sharp
Groos	Smerchanski
Guay	Smith (Saint-Jean)
(St. Boniface)	Stafford
Guilbault	Stanbury
Haidasz	Stewart (Cochrane)
Heilver	Stewart (Okanagan- Kootenay)
Hogarth	St. Pierre
Honey	Sulatycky
Hopkins	Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)	Trudeau
Hymmen	Wahn
Jamieson	Walker
Laing	Watson
(Vancouver South)	Whelan
Lang (Saskatoon- Humboldt)	Whiting
Laniel	Yanakis—108.
Leblanc (Laurier)	

● (4:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate on the main motion. I will try to be brief because the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) also rushed back from Montreal to participate and he tells me that he wants to take his whole 40 minutes as he has many

important points to make. Bill C-139, which is now before the House, seeks to impose higher taxes on the people of Canada. We can go back over the bill and see that its purpose is to amend the Income Tax Act. It asks the members of this House to extend the 3 per cent surtax on individual incomes and corporations to December 31, 1970. I rise to participate in the debate because I have had a number of people make representations to me in my constituency of Yorkton-Melville, where the great majority of the people will be affected by this surtax.

In speaking to this House last month the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance said the bill would affect about 70 per cent of the population. Because of the exemptions contained in it, he estimated that 2,500,000 taxpayers or 30 per cent of the taxpayers of Canada would be exempt. In view of that, Mr. Speaker, and because of the situation facing many of the people in my constituency as well as people in western Canada, I feel that I must bring the views of these people before the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I have to bring to the attention of hon. members—order please. I shall try to bring to the attention of hon. members that there are so many conversations going on in the House at the present time that it is difficult for the Chair, and I am sure for many members, to hear the message the hon. member is attempting to convey to the House.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, one of the reasons I am participating in the debate arises from the representations of my constituents. Another reason is that the tax advocated in this bill is regressive and would only perpetuate the present tax system. Because of the exemptions included, this tax is not as bad as some other measures that the government has implemented, such as the social development tax introduced a year ago which imposed a 2 per cent tax with a ceiling of \$120 a year. This was perhaps the most regressive step taken by this government since assuming office.

There are many important priorities at stake here. The tax itself is just one other measure to perpetuate the social-economic status quo existing in Canada. Because of the increase in poverty and unemployment, there is a greater need to change some of the spending priorities. Instead of spending money on such things as the *Bonaventure* we should spend money on urban renewal,