

Income Tax Act

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member for Témiscamingue, but I thought I might try to restore order to a certain extent. The hon. member for Témiscamingue has the floor and it would be much more simple to let him deliver his speech.

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The hon. member for Témiscamingue attacks me constantly. However, I think I can answer him quite easily, and for doing so I avail myself of the freedom granted the members of this House.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not even familiar with the Standing Orders although he is called a chartered accountant. It might be more to the point to call him a feather-brained member.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member for Témiscamingue that he should rather revert to his text or to the views he intended to express.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister had the floor this afternoon, I too objected to interventions from the opposition side, hoping to hear him, and once you called the opposition members, to order so that the Prime Minister could get on with his speech. I agreed to that. However, when an opposition member has the floor, whom do we hear on the other side of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Of course, I cannot enter into a debate with the hon. member, but may I remind him that if I interrupted the hon. member a while ago, it was precisely to urge the hon. members not to interrupt their colleague from Témiscamingue, since he has the floor.

The hon. member for Laurier could have realized that and I ask all hon. members to allow the hon. member for Témiscamingue to continue his remarks.

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier): I rise on a point of order.

I agree that we should listen to the hon. member for Témiscamingue, but if he launches out into personal attacks, I feel singled out and I cannot help answering. If the hon. member intends to discuss Bill C-259, I am ready to listen to him, even if he wishes to speak all evening.

Mr. Caouette: In fact, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is not happy, he can withdraw behind the curtains.

Incidentally, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) made an observation that is true. Instead of calling him a "chartered accountant", we should say "retarded accountant". It is not quite the same thing!

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Témiscamingue will admit that he is not making things easier right now. I invite the hon. members for Laurier and Témiscamingue to come back to the bill before the House.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister spoke of a million Canadians who will pay no income tax. He did not say those million Canadians represent people who earn the least amongst single people. In fact, they are single people who earn less than \$1,500 a year, and married people who earn less than \$2,850.

The Prime Minister should have told us how much those people will save by no longer paying income tax. They

scarcely paid any previously. Now, between almost nothing and nothing at all, there might be a difference of about \$7 or \$8 a year or 10 to 15 cents a week.

However, the Prime Minister did not say so. He told us a million—it sounds good—Canadians will not be paying income tax and that 1,300,000 will pay less. How will the taxpayers pay less income tax? Even if it were only \$100 a year, it comes to \$2 a week. But not a word about it! No. It is mentioned in a general way that 1,300,000 Canadian taxpayers will pay less income tax. They are bamboozling the people!

And the Prime Minister tried this afternoon to suggest that the members of the opposition were talking about anything except Bill C-259. He said that the Progressive Conservative had talked about India, potato growing in New Brunswick, wheat exports to China, trade with India, and that we forgot to speak to Bill C-259.

An hon. Member: That is true!

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, that is correct, but I heard the speeches of certain Liberals which were not that much more substantial than those made by Conservative members. What is true, as I said it at the beginning of my remarks, is that if the Progressive Conservatives were in the place of the Liberals, we would be considering exactly the same legislation, because the economists of this government are the same as those of the government of ten years ago, who prepared the "gimmick". That is what we are dealing with now. So, let us not be timid. Others do not hesitate to say it.

Tuesday, during the debate on the motion to apply Standing Order 75C, I heard the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) say to the Leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), and I quote:

I suggest that the intelligence of the Leader of the Opposition is exceeded by his sensitiveness to public opinion. No government has any money of its own.

That is an admission on the part of a minister of a sovereign government.

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Why not?

Mr. Caouette: Yes, I said "Why not?" And why shouldn't I? Why can't the government, through Parliament, use the services of the Bank of Canada?

I will remind the House, Mr. Speaker—and I see the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) nodding his approval—that the former Liberal leader, whom the Minister of Public Works, himself a former Liberal leader of British Columbia, followed like a little dog, said in 1935, when I was a liberal:

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caouette: And the Minister of Public Works said yesterday—

Mr. Béchard: Those were the good old days.

Mr. Caouette: One thing is true perhaps: I have remained a true Liberal while the Liberals have become socialists.