

*Income Tax Act*

eminently desirable that this bill be not hastily rushed through the House; it would be wrong to do so. There is no doubt at all that it will be substantially amended at the next session of this House.

All we are asking the government to do at the moment, if lack of clarity is the question bothering people in the country, is to say that it accepts the proposition of the Leader of the Opposition that the bill be passed, but that the implementation of clauses that need clarification, that to some extent are undesirable, that need to have added to them other sections so as to make them workable, be postponed in order to offer the officials of the department an opportunity to speed up the amendment process in which they are now engaged, and to enable the business community, including farmers and others engaged in agriculture, to examine at leisure exactly what is going to be the effect of the legislation when passed. In that way, we can work together in that measure of harmony and co-operation that is so essential to securing those amendments that the minister will bring down in order to make the legislation more desirable. I am as satisfied as I possibly can be that thousands and thousands of people, including those who should be knowledgeable of these things, have yet to determine what in their opinion will be the ultimate impact of this legislation. I am sure there are those in the department who are conscientious, honest and hard working who believe the same thing.

Surely, our suggestion would restore a measure of confidence to the economic life of this country and to the business and agricultural community, unlike the situation today where there is no confidence at all. I think that a declaration by the government that, in its view, the proposition made by the Leader of the Opposition should be accepted would do more than any other thing to revive confidence among leaders and those who follow them in the economy and business life of this country. I venture to say that when and if the President of the Privy Council or the Minister of Finance stands up and says that yes, Mr. Stanfield, the Leader of the Opposition, is correct in his proposal—

**Mr. Gibson:** A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth on a point of order.

**Mr. Gibson:** I respectfully submit that the use of a member's name is out of order. I would ask the hon. member not to refer to another member of this House by name.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The hon. member is quite right. I was only quoting from memory a newspaper reference to the name of Mr. Stanfield, and that is all.

**Mr. Gibson:** You have been around here long enough to obey the rules.

**Mr. Baldwin:** I was talking about the question of confidence, and as long as we have interruptions like that from those who support the government, obviously there can be no confidence in the government. There are some parliamentary secretaries who have indicated through speeches in this House on this issue that they lack confidence in the government.

**An hon. Member:** That is not true.

**Mr. Baldwin:** That is as true as anything I have said today. Confidence is what we need here. This government is showing today an obvious bias against private initiative, enterprise and incentive. The major legislative programs are set up in such a way as to constitute the destruction of initiative and incentive, things that made this country what it is today.

I think we all recognize that in the social structure we now have there is a duty cast upon us to apply certain minimum standards of support. But we are not seeing this, we are seeing much more. We are seeing a situation where the government of this country deliberately, and with design and malice, is directing its attention toward providing sanctions, punitive sanctions, against those who are prepared to work in the expectation that initiative ought to be rewarded.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired, unless he has unanimous consent to continue.

**Mr. Baldwin:** I would be glad to carry on if requested, Mr. Chairman.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Would the committee give unanimous consent to allow the member to complete his remarks?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Before giving the floor to the hon. member for Peace River, perhaps I should take this opportunity of announcing the proceedings on the adjournment motion tonight. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, finance; the hon. member for St. John's East, fisheries; the hon. member for Winnipeg North, power.

**Mr. Baldwin:** May I thank the committee for its courtesy. When I have concluded, as requested by the hon. member for Sarnia, I think it was, I shall identify the authorship of these remarks.

I list some of these measures I have referred to which have been proposed in recent months. There were some of the farm program bills, part of the competition bill, part of the labour code and the so-called new aspects of the tax bill. It is true that the latter bill has been reduced in severity from the drastic proposals of the white paper, but it still contains real punishment for those who believe in the value of the individual enterprise system. When one has been threatened with a great injustice, one sometimes accepts a smaller injustice as a favour. This is the philosophy of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Minister of Finance. They make a great threat and then reduce it, and as a result the smaller injustice seems almost to be a friendly act. An injustice occurs when the many are denied reasonable rewards and recognition for their contribution and others are unduly rewarded.

The twilight of our society grows on us when we see the extent of excessive government intervention and control