

being asked because he was politely answering one of his Tory colleagues to whom he was speaking.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I rise on the same point of order. I would like to amend slightly what the House leader has just said. The minister was in the House yesterday. He was asked the same question, whether he was going to answer questions at the end of each speech. He said, "no", that he was going to make a list of them, and when the general debate on item one was over he would answer those points that he could. That was the undertaking he gave last night. I do not think that it is harmful to the House to know he made that pledge to us.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Perhaps the Chair might intervene for a moment. My understanding was as indicated by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain, that hon. members would not be seeking answers to questions while debate is on clause one, but rather that those questions would be pursued under the relevant clauses. There is no Standing Order of the House at this moment that necessitates that. It is simply, as I understand it, the way members have indicated they wish to proceed.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Chairman, I am not that enthused with the arrangement. However, if it was an understanding arrived at through discussion by all members of the House, certainly I will respect that. I have a few questions for the minister and I hope he will take note of them this afternoon although, I do not know why he would have his officials here if he is not answering questions. My questions are not so much to do with what is in the bill but rather about matters which were left out of the bill. I would have hoped that those questions could have been answered, but I am prepared, if everyone else is, to wait until the minister sums up the discussions with respect to clause 1 of the bill.

● (1710)

At the outset, I want to make a few comments following on those of my colleagues who spoke earlier. The government should not be too surprised if, when dealing with a tax bill, we talk about such matters as energy, and the economic policy in general, and matters which strike even deeper to the very foundation of the institution as it will be affected in the future by the arrangements we are presently discussing with regard to constitutional reform.

I have here a document. It is a copy of a book in our library which the hon. member for Victoria dug up. It lays out the procedure one would follow to establish an extreme radical alternative to the type of western democracy on which our system is built. The book is called "Birth of the Communist Manifesto". The early advocates of communism talked about some of the things one would have to do in order to achieve a redistribution of wealth and the transfer of productive mechanisms away from the bourgeoisie to the workers. According to this book, the following would be required, and I quote:

Income Tax Act

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of wastelands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

It goes on and on. What struck me when reading this is that when you go over it you see that many of these things have already been achieved in our society. This document is the foundation for a very progressive and graduated income tax act. The imposition of those kinds of taxes on property would demean them in a way to affect their value when inherited by one's children.

We already have the centralization of banks. Of late, in our constitutional debate, we have been talking about the nationalization of property. It is being said that the right to own property will no longer be looked at as a right in the future, but rather as a privilege. The right to own property, which in my opinion is the most fundamental basis of western civilization, would no longer be respected in our constitution. I wish to quote another sentence from this very interesting document:

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.

I do not suggest this government is about to go out and confiscate property. However, we do have that in our energy program. There is a clear confiscation of private assets in the sense that, if they are located on federal lands, the Crown corporation will be directed to move in and assume 25 per cent ownership in the lands and the improvements that have been made under the lease without compensation. If that is not confiscation, I would like someone more knowledgeable to explain what it is.

These people, together with their friends to my left, have done more than that. They are abolishing God. I was tempted to stand up before question period today and move a motion under Standing Order 43 suggesting that we rename this place Babylon, and rename our Prime Minister "the king of Babylon". Obviously he has anointed himself as God. He is wiser than the Almighty. We no longer need any reference to God in our constitution. I do not want to be unkind to the right hon. gentleman, but I sincerely hope that he will not be destined to suffer the same fate as the king of Babylon. As you know, when the king of Babylon denounced Jehovah, a mysterious fiery hand came out and wrote on the wall, "weighed, counted and divided". Of course he was assassinated the same night he made the pronouncement. I do not wish that our Prime Minister be assassinated, but I wish he would reassess in more realistic terms the effects of his type of a new society which he is perpetrating upon us.