

*Income Tax Act*

economic activity is to give more tax concessions to business. I am reminded, sir, when I see them flying in the face of the experience of the last 10 years and suggesting that this is the key to expansion and development, of the story about a rather crusty English judge who was called upon to adjudicate a fine point in heraldry. After having listened to the various heralds and pursuivants, and so forth, the old judge said—it seemed to him that they were a lot of silly old men who did not know their own silly old business. I suggest that some of these stout defenders of free enterprise do not understand the rules by which their sacred world of business operates.

I was interested last night to hear the hon. member for Davenport have this to say, as reported at page 817 of *Hansard* for October 22:

Our kind of economy works best in circumstances where responsibility for economic decision making is decentralized and in so far as possible is kept in private hands.

This, Mr. Chairman, after he had spent an hour telling us how our economy was not working satisfactorily in circumstances where the decision making was left in private hands. It is on this point of the faith, the rather touching faith, in the wisdom and acumen of the business community, that we in this party have to part company with both our Conservative and our Liberal friends. How anyone can stand up in this house and affirm his faith in the business community and its collective wisdom after decades of mismanagement, passes my comprehension. This is the business community which in 1939 went on strike in order to force the nation, in its extremity, to pay blackmail; this is the business community that since the end of the war has been on a drunken, staggering course of boom and recession, and over-extended some sections of the economy while starving others. This is the business community in which the Liberal and Conservative parties would have us pin our faith and our hope.

I am not concerned so much, Mr. Chairman, with trying to allot the blame between the present government and previous administrations; that would be an exercise in pointless futility. These are not so much crimes of government as crimes of the business world. The crime of government has been that they have stood by and allowed these things to happen. Today, both the Conservatives and the Liberals reveal that they are still wedded to the proposition that the chief purpose of economic activity is to provide an opportunity for a business enterprise to amass profits, with the public welfare entering into the matter

only incidentally. We are being told today, Mr. Chairman, that there is a new Liberal party. Great stress is laid on the presence in the entourage of the Leader of the Opposition of a number of bright young men, of bright young faces, who we are assured are all Liberal with a small "l". In fact, in private, it is whispered in our ears that they are actually socialists.

However, I noticed during the recent election campaign that there appeared to be no lack of funds for television programs, for jet planes, for huge newspaper advertisements, and so on. From my fairly extensive knowledge about collecting campaign funds in many election campaigns I am constrained to believe that there could only have been one source of the very lavish funds which this new Liberal party had at its disposal during the election last June. This source could only be the surplus of corporate wealth in this country. At the same time that they use the bright young faces of the 'bright young small "l" Liberals to convince the progressively minded people of this country that we have a new Liberal party dedicated to new propositions, dedicated to changing our way of life, they have of course to reassure the business community that they have nothing to fear from this new Liberal party. It is prepared to do business at the old stand just as it did previously.

This is a difficult and delicate performance calling for very careful footwork. The business world has to be convinced that this one particular party could serve its interests better than the other party, and at the same time the voters have to be persuaded that the same party is more concerned for the common man than for any section of our community. I noted the other day an article in a newspaper written by an eminent member of the press gallery for whose opinions I have the utmost respect, in which the proposition was discussed as to whether or not there would eventually be a merger between the New Democratic party and Liberal party. I have, I think, pointed out that there is an impossible gulf that lies between us, that lies between this party and any party which is convinced that the affairs of our community can safely be left in the hands of the business community, and in particular that dominant section of that community which today dominates the whole of our economic life.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I am a socialist; in fact I should say an unreconstructed socialist, more convinced today than I was 30 years ago that the solutions to the problems of our nation cannot be found within the framework of private enterprise, of capitalism, of the business world. The institutions of that world,