

*Income Tax Act*

stand up and say: The Social Crediters "are starting the money press".

**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):** This is quite funny!

**Mr. Caouette:** It is funny, indeed, but what is funny is to see those funny guys, the liberals, being funny. And when the Liberals were not in power, the Tories were having the same reaction. And that was thought to be funny.

**Mr. Asselin:** No one ever talked about the money press.

**Mr. Caouette:** The hon. member for Charlevoix never talked about it because he does not know how it works. The hon. member for Charlevoix is consistent. He came to see me the other day behind the curtains to ask me how it would work. I told him it would work very well.

**The Deputy Chairman:** The Chair hesitates to interrupt the hon. member but it can hardly see the relation between the hon. member's remarks and the two sections under consideration. I think all hon. members are interested in the analysis of the problems that are presently facing this country but since the committee must study two specific sections of bill C-259, the Chair would appreciate it greatly if the hon. member for Témiscamingue would relate his remarks from time to time to the sections being considered.

**Mr. Caouette:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not used to relating my remarks to just anything. I am used to making remarks and at this time we are discussing sections 109 and 110. Several things are related to them. The objectives of sections 109 and 110 are an increase in the purchasing power of Canadian consumers by allowing exemptions of \$1,500 for single persons and \$2,850 for married couples.

The minister of Finance himself said not so long ago that the vital minimum was \$3,000. A great deal of things are connected with that minimum and we bring proposals that would enable hon. members to study something. The government does not give them anything to examine; we are the ones who give them something to think about and those who can think—there are some who cannot, and I sometimes wonder if the minister of Finance can—can at least consider our proposals.

Mr. Chairman, the government proposals under which a single person's income up to \$1,500 and the income of married persons up to \$2,850 is to be tax free do not meet the people's requirements. The government itself admits there must be at least a \$3,000 minimum, in order that people may live or at least exist.

We ask, as my colleague from Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) did this afternoon, tax exemptions of \$3,500 for single persons and \$5,000 for married persons. We, members of this House, have tax-free expense accounts up to \$8,000. I have yet to see a Liberal say in this House or in his constituency that it was inflation in his pockets. Everybody thinks it is all right. And for ordinary workers, millworkers, plant workers, farm people the exemption is \$2,850.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that all incomes under \$3,000 for single persons and under \$5,000 for married persons should be tax free. Let us establish in this country not what we call a welfare state but a state of social security,

[Mr. Caouette.]

a state where people are provided with social security, where they feel free, where they are still human beings, where the individual can act by himself, not through the government's will or through any other organization the human being must be respected.

Mr. Chairman, the day we get that, Canada will be sheltered from outside attacks, revolts, revolutions, revolutionaries and terrorists. But until then, if the government members, the ministry and the other hon. members remain idle, before not too many years there will be in Canada terrible bloodshed as occurred in some countries in Europe or Asia.

If that is the kind of administration we want, all we have to do is to let things go. But if we want something else, we should assume our responsibilities. I call upon the Liberal members, who are holding a caucus tomorrow morning, to tell the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister, the federal cabinet, the government should be told such things. Hon. members should assume their responsibilities. We are the silent majority. If we do not act, the revolutionary minority will crush us as it crushed the people in Russia, Poland, Hungary and China. This is not what we want. We want a Canada that belongs to us, to which we can contribute. Therefore, we should pull together, not as members of this or that political party, but as Canadian citizens determined to save their country, Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** More! More!

• (9:20 p.m.)

**Mr. La Salle:** Mr. Chairman, after the various speeches made today, I would like in turn to give my opinion on those most important clauses.

I admit that this bill is important because it is bringing a number of changes which I think are necessary. As a member of Parliament it is my duty to express my opinion on sections 109 and 110 which, I think, are far from meeting the needs of Canadians.

Many people before me have informed the minister and the government of their claims and have asked their representatives in Parliament to unite so as to convince the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) that the exemptions of \$1,500 and \$2,850 are inadequate.

All we need is to compare with the social security pensions which allow a \$3,060 exemption for people aged 65 or more. If we want to justify our positions it is quite easy to prove that a couple or a much younger family has greater needs and this \$1,500 exemption for a single person or \$2,850 for a married couple is inadequate. I think this is self-explanatory.

This is why I want to draw the attention of the House and of all government members who will have the opportunity, as stated earlier by the Social Credit leader, of discussing this question with the ministers and the Prime Minister.

I would request their greatest consideration to the "inadequate minimum".

We referred to a \$5,000 yearly minimum for married people and one of \$3,000 for a single person. No member of this House could say that a person earning \$60 per