

Income Tax Act

member for Villeneuve, but I am quoting page 6905 of *Hansard* where the hon. member for Villeneuve, leader of the Ralliement créditiste, was stating as follows:

We voted and the government was defeated. Under the circumstances, there is but one way out, and that is to go to the people.

This was the statement by the leader of these honorable gentlemen to my left and I am trying to explain—

Mr. Rondeau: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I have in hand the official report of the debates of the House mentioned by the hon. member for Sainte-Marie and I would like him to tell us on what page he finds the words "Under the circumstances, I see no other way out for the government than to go to the people" ascribed to the leader of the Ralliement créditiste (Mr. Caouette).

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I have just mentioned it. My hon. friend was nervous. It is on page 6905 (6-9-0-5). It is not a phone number, but the page number in the issue of February 21, 1968 (1-9-6-8) of the official report of the debates of the House of Commons which all hon. members receive at their office and which they collect or keep.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my friends will not deny a statement appearing in *Hansard* and which was made by the leader of the Ralliement créditiste. I will quote another one to enable them to understand better. Since we are considering the bill concerning the surtax, may I quote from the same page 6905 (6-9-0-5)—it is not neither a bingo game, Mr. Speaker.—I want to be very clear for our friends. In the second column of this page, we find the following words of the hon. member for Villeneuve:

We objected to Bill No. C-193 at the resolution stage. We are still opposed to it, and if the motion for third reading has been rejected by a vote in the House, I see no other way out for the government than to go to the people and ask for their opinion on the way in which the business of the country is to be dealt with.

This, Mr. Speaker, was the final ultimatum, the position that the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste had taken in the House before subsequent consultations.

I do not quite understand. I could quote several other statements of the hon. leader of the Ralliement Créditiste which puzzle me because I am sure the members of his party are honest representatives of the people. But I cannot understand that today, when we are discussing the very substance of Bill C-225 which is in fact the repetition of Bill C-193, we find so many contradictions in it that we could believe the words of some people who must represent the population with honesty and loyalty and who say to the House: We stand absolutely alone as protectors of the little man.

We are against the government continuing to impose this surtax on the people.

[Mr. Valade.]

Mr. Speaker, I say it is not only my right but my duty in this House, especially as a representative of the working class, to protest against this systematic, gradual and repeated tax increase, at the expense of the small wage-earner, of the worker. The steadfastness of Conservative members was put to the test but we have never indulged in petty politics and time-serving as we have seen others do since yesterday on this question.

If the Ralliement créditiste had wanted to spare the population from the effects of a surtax, they should have taken the same stand in 1968, at the time of the vote against the Liberal government, and that same government would no longer be at the head of this country to extend the surtax and taxes against which the Creditistes today seem to stand as champions.

Mr. Speaker, if at that time, the Creditistes had not reversed their position ten times, the government would not have enjoyed the reprieve they owe us and we would have taken a specific honest and clear position. If today we have to stand up again and tell the government: We refuse that tax extension you propose, if we have to do so, it is because the Ralliement créditiste maintained and helped to maintain the Liberal administration under Mr. Pearson.

Mr. Speaker, I am not participating in this debate merely to attack without cause my colleagues in the House, but in order to show the facts as they are, so that such unacceptable and unexplainable contradictions may not be made without rebuttal.

Mr. Speaker, we have only to refer to some newspaper articles. I have here—

Mr. Rondeau: *Montréal-Matin*.

Mr. Valade: —*La Presse*. My hon. friend was wrong once again. Ten mistakes so far, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing new in that. And now one more.

Mr. Speaker, I have here the front page of *La Presse*, dated February 24, 1968, with a big headline which, for our friends' information, reads:

Caouette Saves the Government.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Caouette saved the government against a Progressive Conservative vote, in order to maintain in office a government that had then decided to impose a surtax on the taxpayers. This is what the newspapers wrote.

In another report published not by *Montréal-Matin* but by *La Presse*, February 24, 1968, on page 47, one could read this:

The Liberal Party owes a great deal to Réal Caouette for his right-about face.

Those are not our comments, Mr. Speaker, but those of newspapermen who had examined the statement made by the leader of the Ralliement créditiste on February 21, along those lines: "The government has been defeated and must resign. It should go before the people". The day after, that is on February 22, he said: "We did not vote against the government we voted against the motion".