Income Tax

• (1622)

There is one other matter I want to mention regarding Bill C-11 which concerns itself primarily with Section 143, identified with communal organizations. For some time in this House there has been a debate raging back and forth regarding how best and how fairly we should tax a communal organization, and I have especially in mind the Hutterites of Canada.

Having spoken to them I simply want to state they generally find Section 143 acceptable and fair. They have questions specifically regarding the age of 18 being used for calculating the time an individual enters the work force. The Income Tax Act in respect of all other Canadians relates to the time they actually enter the work force rather than a chronological age. However, I believe that matter is of relatively insignificant importance.

The other matter the Minister of Finance should look at in some detail in the future is that of distribution of wages and whether or not these communal people should be allowed, as are other farmers, to stipulate a certain amount of wages as having been paid to family members. As I understand the situation, that is not possible under Section 143.

In conclusion I want to say that this country has great potential, and I have mentioned one in my own area, but two things must happen. We must have economic leadership and a total turn-around of the kind of spending the government has been doing. That is the first thing that must happen. We must leave more money in the pockets of Canadian taxpayers, whether they be the wage earners or those in corporations, in order to generate enthusiasm and confidence in our economy. Frankly, the government is not able to do that. This government has frittered away the potential of Canadians and, particularly, the future of our young people. The potential is there and hope can be restored. But the government is bereft of hope and has shown a complete lack of leadership. For that reason it should be condemned, and condemned also for its economic policies.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Jack H. Horner (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) in the presentation of tax bill C-11 because of its many good qualities. I suggest it will help the people on low incomes and will encourage further development on the part of the resource industries. It will help people in regard to life insurance, foreign investment, and capital gains.

I have listened with great interest and have read a number of the speeches by my former colleagues in the House during this debate, and I can say that some were good and some were bad. Those that were good were more concerned about the country, while the bad ones were more concerned about the political fate of the members making them.

It was interesting to note that at the very recent convention in Quebec City members opposite were so afraid in respect of leadership that they were not allowed to discuss anything but [Mr. Epp.]

support for their leader. No policy discussions took place or were voted upon. It was a unique experience, I am sure, for the Conservative party. I am certain that I was missed only by a number of members of the press, but my attendance at that kind of a convention would have been completely out of place because my concern has always rested with the country.

An hon. Member: They never asked for you once, Jack.

Mr. Horner: I appreciate that, but I want to make it abundantly clear that my concerns have always been directed in respect of the good of the country and not the question of whether the leadership was strong enough to withstand some diversity of opinion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: I was rather shocked during the debate this afternoon on the question of privilege that arose, as I have been shocked by the debate that has taken place in the House of Commons this week and last. The only conclusion I can draw is that in the absence of that right hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), the Conservative party has attempted to ride to power on the backs of the Mounties.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: That is shameful.

Mr. Horner: I would point out particularly that they have been doing this when that right hon. gentleman, who has always been a great defender of the RCMP, was absent from the House. He would not condone that sort of action.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I should just like to bring to the attention of the House that the right hon, gentleman has not been feeling well, with the result he has not been in the House for the last two or three days. Otherwise he would have been here.

Mr. Horner: I never implied for a moment that the right hon, gentleman was absent because he was asked to stay away by the whip of that party or anyone else. I just said that had he been here hon, members over there would have been given better advice. They would not have been attacking the RCMP and we would not have heard members from that side hollering, "Lay charges against the RCMP".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like you to have the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner) tell us the clause of Bill C-11 to which he is addressing his remarks.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, the hon member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) commenced his remarks with his thoughts about the question of order raised after the question period. I felt that I should enjoy the same privilege, and it is in that vein I made my comments.