

Income Tax Act

having moved it, slipped it among the others, which will enable Canadians to breathe a little easier.

I am convinced that by carrying on with the consideration of this legislation, we will manage to find other means to alleviate the tax burden of taxpayers, so that the law may be more logical and that taxpayers pay less and less taxes.

I know that the tax legislation means a substantial increase in taxes. Taxes are reduced in certain areas but increased in others.

Since all citizens may benefit from the proposed amendment, we are prepared to support it.

[*English*]

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak at this time. I have nothing much to say, in fact. My contribution on this particular subject was to have been my vote. I intend to vote this amendment down, or contribute to voting it down. But I thought it was funny to sit here and listen to the two opposition parties argue about which was further down the road to Damascus and which one was being blinded by the other's dust. Sitting on this side I must say that those two parties, the Conservative party and the New Democratic Party, are very much alike.

This is a situation which disturbs me very much. I would not support the amendment, but I would very much welcome a true Socialist alternative before the people of Canada. I would be glad to see a party which stood for a new concept of industrial democracy, a party with its own sense of social justice, a party with new ideas.

An hon. Member: What about the amendment?

Mr. Kaplan: What we find, if I can put it in a gentle way, is a group of benign chisellers who come before us in a well-meaning manner saying something like this: "You have proposed a minimum wage of \$1.75. Why not make it \$2.00? You have proposed \$1,400 as the minimum exemption. Make it \$2,000—we will settle for \$1,800." This is their style. They are quite satisfied with the social order. I regard my party as being a more revolutionary party than theirs.

I can remember when I was a little boy listening to the hon. member for York South on the radio. He was saying then exactly the same thing that I heard him say a month ago during the Ontario provincial campaign. The people of Canada, he said, are not fools; they will reject the old line parties. That statement is the oldest line in Canadian politics.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The Chairman: Order, please. With respect, I think the Chair is able to conduct the proceedings of this committee more to the advantage of hon. members if, when an hon. member rises in his place, he indicates to the Chair why he is rising. This will give the Chair the opportunity to recognize him. I recognize the hon. member for Hamilton West.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Chairman, I do not need any gratuitous remarks from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance. With all due respect to the Chair, I did point out that I was rising on a point of order. My point of order is this: I have been sitting in this chamber

[*Mr. Latulippe.*]

for days listening to contributions that had some merit. Having heard the Chair admonish and chastise those hon. members who did not follow the rule of relevancy, my point of order is that we on this side had hoped the hon. member for Don Valley would make a fantastic contribution—

Some hon. Members: He did.

Mr. Alexander:—as he was challenged to do by the hon. member for Broadview. But instead of that we listened to fairy tales. With all due respect, I think the hon. member's remarks have been irrelevant to the subject matter under debate this afternoon.

The Chairman: Order. I think I should say to the hon. member for Hamilton West that I was unable to ascertain that he was rising on a point of order because his microphone was not switched on. However, it did seem to me that perhaps the hon. member for Don Valley, who has the floor, was wandering a bit and I would invite him to come back to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Chairman, as it happens I was just coming back to my main point, which was to indicate that I regarded the benign plea for an extra \$75 across the board as one that we should reject. I was characterizing it in terms of the whole behaviour of the New Democratic Party. May I finish in one more sentence? Decade after decade this party, which purports to have something new and which rejects, it seems to me by its own words, the "old line", proves it is the same old party, a party where power is inherited, as is its leadership.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Chairman, I have a few additional comments to make on this amendment. If this committee ever required an endorsement of the amendment and arguments to support it, I think we have had them from the hon. member for Don Valley. Not once did he deal with the substance of the proposal we are debating. Faced with the logic of our argument and the justice of our stand, the Liberal party have resorted to vile rhetoric, to wild benality. I would have expected from the hon. member for Don Valley far more than the kind of performance he has given us.

An hon. Member: He made an excellent contribution.

Mr. Saltsman: He may have made a contribution to this debate, and it is understandable that there are divisions of opinion and people with differing views, but if the hon. member has differing views and has some substantial disagreement with this amendment, why did he not say so? Whether we are nice guys or whether we are not, whether on occasion the New Democratic Party and the Conservative party happen to agree, has really nothing to do with what we are discussing. We are discussing something that is of vital importance to almost six million taxpayers in this country. If there were any need for reassurance to us on this side that we are on the right track and that the government does not have any substantial or good reason for rejecting this amendment, then we received that assurance by the intervention that has just been made.