Division

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

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

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Blackburn
Brewin
Burton
Carter
Coates
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Fairweather
Flemming
Fortin
Gauthier
Gleave
Harding
Harkness
Horner
Howe
Knight
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Latulippe
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacKay
Macquarrie
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Mazankowski
Monteith
Muir
Murta
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rose
Rowland
Saltsman
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thompson (Red Deer)
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Winch
Yewchuk—71.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Barrett
Béchard
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Clermont
Cobbe
Corriveau
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
De Bané
Dupras
Duquet
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lajoie
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lind
Loiselle
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McNulty
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
O'Connell
Olson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Rochon
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting—93.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that are left this evening I shall at least be able to present the amendment to the motion for third reading which we would like the House to consider, and by hearing the amendment tonight hon. members will have an opportunity to think about it.

It is clear that this bill has occasioned debate in a good many areas. It has done so with respect to the things that are in it and the things that are not in it, with respect to its complexities and its incomprehensibility and also with respect to the manner in which it is being put to Parliament. In my view, sir, when the debate is all over, if there is one issue that will be of concern to the largest number of Canadians it is the fact that after 22 years, when the present government got around to doing something about the exemption levels in the Income Tax Act, all it could do was to raise those levels to $1,500 single and $2,850 married.

Considering the fact that it was in 1949 that the present levels of $1,000 single and $2,000 married were set, we feel, and I believe the people of Canada agree with us, that it is an insult for the government to raise the levels by only the amounts indicated in this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is also our view that this was an excellent time for the government to deal with the matter that is usually covered by adjusting the exemption levels by using the technique of a tax credit. When we were in committee of the whole dealing with clause 1 of the bill I presented an amendment which was accepted by the Chair and voted upon but which at that time was defeated by a vote of 64 to 42.