Income Tax Act

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hon. members over there moan and say "Oh!" If they do not want to pay attention to what I have said, they can go and read history for themselves. The facts I have given this afternoon can be ascertained by anyone who goes to the library and searches through the records. The hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen) is making an interjection of some kind. I do not get what he is saying but I recognize the timber of his voice.

An hon. Member: And the timber in his head.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, I would not say that. One of the most disappointing things is to hear the minister go around boasting about these changes in exemption levels when in comparative terms he has done nothing.

Mr. Sulatycky: Play the record over again.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member across the way, one of the parliamentary secretaries, wants me to play the record over again. When one scores at all, the true nature of what it is to be a Liberal comes out. He just likes controlling the levers of power. He likes running the show. But as for concern about the ordinary people of this country, he just isn't interested at all.

• (5:50 p.m.)

To give this House the opportunity to vote for a reconsideration of this whole question of taxing incomes in the range of just \$500 above \$1,500 and just \$500 above \$2,850, I present the amendment that I read to the House last night. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands:

That Bill C-259 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole House for the purpose of reconsidering the proposed new section 117(1) as set out in clause 1 on pages 313 and 314, and in particular for the purpose of reconsidering the changing of the figure "17%" in line 33 on page 313 to "2%" and consequentially reducing the amount at the beginning of each of the paragraphs (b) to (m), both inclusive, on page 314, by \$75.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The advance notice given by the hon. member has given the Chair ample time to examine his motion as to its procedural acceptability. I will put the motion at this time as accepted procedurally. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), moves:

That Bill C-259 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole House for the purpose of reconsidering the proposed new section 117(1) as set out in clause 1 on pages 313 and 314, and in particular for the purpose of reconsidering the changing of the figure "17%" in line 33 on page 313 to "2%" and consequentially reducing the amount at the beginning of each of the paragraphs (b) to (m), both inclusive, on page 314, by \$75.

Mr. John Roberts (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Peters: Tell us what you really said at Thunder Bay, John.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Roberts: —the pleasure I have in following the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is somewhat diminished by the recognition that he has once again returned to that pure claim for moral sanctity that so often decorates his addresses to this House. He leaves no stone unturned in his desire to assure us all that only he and his party really care for the poor and distressed of this country.

Mr. Lewis: Now, cut that out.

Mr. Roberts: I wish to assure him that those on this side of the House do not in any way yield to him in our desire to improve conditions in this country.

Mr. Lewis: Do something about it, then.

Mr. Roberts: I had not intended originally to take part in this debate. It had seemed to me that in terms of redundancy and repetition the debate had gone on long enough. If it were considered, as the official opposition contend, that there was not enough time to discuss many more things of importance, then it is surely remarkable that those hon. members have not taken the opportunity during the time they have spent debating the bill in this House to present their own ideas on the bill, rather than continuing with their indecision, their obstruction, their little games of parliamentary procedure, hiding behind the curtains and rushing in with great fanfare, threatening to shred the bill to pieces. These are the actions more of publicity hounds than of parliamentarians trying to present a considered view.

I had not considered it necessary to take part in this debate because, as a member of the committee on finance, I did spend two years considering tax reform. During those two years I had ample opportunity to present my own ideas on where we should go in terms of tax reform. I did so, and the final Commons committee report was very close to what I felt should be presented to this House.

Mr. Hees: You are a very modest fellow, John.

Mr. Roberts: At least I am slightly more modest than the hon. member, whose view is that last year he had one fault—he was modest. This year he is perfect. However, I have some difficulty in taking the hon. member seriously. I am always afraid that, like some aged Rudy Vallee, the hon. member is about to break into a buck and wing across the House.

Mr. Hees: That was a dandy one, John.

Mr. Roberts: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I felt that I had had the opportunity of presenting my ideas about tax reform, and my support for the committee report was well known. However, yesterday in this House the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) challenged me, and members who think as I do, to rise and to place their views before the House. I welcome that challenge. The remarks of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday were based upon a report of a speech of mine which he had read in a newspaper, the *Globe and Mail* I believe. I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his recognition during the course of his speech that it might very well be the case distorted report. That is in fact the case.