

she represented. She said, as reported at page 8356 of *Hansard*:

The result is that this tax bill continues to widen the gap between the "haves" and "have nots" in this country. It increases the comfortable insulation of the top 20 per cent of our population who enjoy 40 per cent of the good things of this world, and of Canada in particular, and makes more acute the humiliating poverty of the lowest 20 per cent who try hard to cling to their portion of only 7 per cent of the national income. Their position has not changed very much or, if at all, only for the worse.

I heartily concur with that.

Somewhere in between are the middle 60 per cent who are trying to climb the slippery slope to security while those at the bottom of the slope are sliding to the ragged edge of poverty.

That is part of what the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway had to say, and I agree with her. She then went on to explain how the elderly people would be affected by the provisions of this bill and asked what would be done for them. I wish the Minister of Finance were in his seat so he could answer that question.

• (9:20 p.m.)

What is being done under this tax bill to help the unemployed? What is being done to help those on fixed incomes? What is happening to those who have been on fixed incomes for the past five or six years? Last February a situation was brought to my attention. It involved a lady 82 years of age. She is a widow of a former captain in the Ottawa fire department. He retired after 42 years' service and went on pension. When he died, this elderly lady was left with only \$133.61 per month because his pension lapsed. Her rent was \$117.50 per month. This left her with \$16.11 per month for food and clothing. What will this tax bill do for people like her? I was glad to learn recently that as a result of efforts of the Ontario finance corporation she is now living in a new apartment and paying rent of only \$37.70 per month.

I cannot see anything in this tax bill that will offer any relief to people of this kind. We must have tax incentives. Members on all sides of the House have advocated the removal of the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials. This may be a small item but it would relieve situations such as the one to which I have referred. Even members of the Prime Minister's party have supported this suggestion. But this will not be done through Bill C-259. That is why I support our amendment.

This tax reform measure first came to our attention in the form of a government white paper. I suggest it was not worth the paper it was printed on. That is the situation with which we are now faced. Many things have happened since the introduction of that white paper. We have higher unemployment, higher prices, lower seasonally adjusted manufacturing shipments, lower seasonally adjusted new orders, additional seasonally adjusted unfilled orders and higher seasonally adjusted inventories. That is what has happened in our industries—and it is not the result of the recently imposed surtax on U.S. imports. As a result of that surtax I am sure we can expect more readjustments. Canadian people, such as members of this House, are aware that the government has sent a number of people to Washington to negotiate in respect of this surcharge. I do not suppose they have accomplished anything. They might just as well have stayed at home.

### Division

**Mr. Alexander:** They should have picked up the telephone.

**Mr. Gundlock:** They should have picked up the telephone, for all the good they did. The lack of action by the government is very discouraging. We had to wait for the hon. member for Edmonton West to bring forth an amendment to this bill in order to do something constructive.

The support the Minister of Finance thinks he has for this bill is not really support: his supporters are simply saying that there should be reform which will be of benefit to the people of this country, without suggesting any specific reforms.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) to the main motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Lambert, Edmonton West) which was negatived on the following division:

### YEAS

#### Messrs:

Aiken	MacInnis (Cape
Alexander	Breton-East
Alkenbrack	Richmond)
Baldwin	MacInnis (Mrs.)
Bell	Macquarrie
Benjamin	McCutcheon
Burton	McGrath
Code	McKinley
Crouse	McQuaid
Dionne	Mazankowski
Douglas	Monteith
Downey	Murta
Fairweather	Nesbitt
Forrestall	Nowlan
Fortin	Nystrom
Gauthier	Paproski
Gilbert	Peddle
Gleave	Ritchie
Godin	Rodrigue
Harding	Rondeau
Horner	Rose
Knowles (Winnipeg	Rowland
North Centre)	Ryan
Korchinski	Rynard
Lambert	Saltsman
(Edmonton West)	Skoberg
Lewis	Skoreyko
Lundrigan	Stanfield