

Income Tax Act

sumably a piecemeal attack on the problem of foreign ownership. I agree. This is what we have been attempting to tell the government for months. I wonder how many government supporters feel the same way.

Mr. McBride: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition referred to the hon. member for York North, I wonder whether he intended to refer to the hon. member for York Simcoe (Mr. Roberts).

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, there are so many hon. members disagreeing with the government these days that it is difficult to keep them straight. I will be happy to accept the correction of the hon. member for Lanark. I think it was the hon. member for York Simcoe. I thank the hon. member for his helpful correction. I will be happy to receive any correction from him at any time that is helpful. I submit that the point is made very effectively by the hon. member to whom I have referred.

An hon. Member: Why don't you quote Hees?

Mr. Hees: He has.

Mr. Stanfield: If you do not know what your economic goals and your economic strategy are, then you do not have an effective tax reform. I wonder how many other members do not support the government and agree with the hon. member for York-Simcoe. If some hon. members do, I think they should have the courage to tell this House and the Canadian people what they think of this legislation. On behalf of the Canadian people, and on behalf of the Canadian economy, I ask and indeed I challenge them to do so without any further delay.

One of the most incredible things about this legislation is that even while it was being jammed down our throats and the throats of the Canadian people, the government blandly announced it intended to make even more changes. Part of the reason for this, of course was to head off the Senate at the pass. I suppose the minister is secretly conferring with the Senate now, but that is for them to deal with and not me. Sure, there are going to be lots more amendments to this bill. More were announced or indicated, as I say, even after the minister introduced the discussion on third reading of the bill, following the use of closure at the committee stage and the indication that closure would be used at the third reading stage. How much further can the government go in showing its contempt for its own supporters in the House, and how much further can the government go in showing its contempt for the law itself?

Of course, there will be many more amendments to this bill but the Minister of Finance in defending himself says we will not know how much this bill needs to be changed until we try it out on the Canadian people. Can you imagine that! The Minister of Finance justifies pressing ahead with the bill, with all the amendments that have had to be made, despite the fact that nobody understands many of the provisions of the bill. He justifies it on the basis that we will not know what amendments need to be made until we try it out on the Canadian people. Well, sir, there you have the Minister of Finance unintentionally summing up the government's whole attitude toward the Canadian taxpayer who is to be a guinea pig to be used as the government may see fit.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

• (3:50 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The government has charged those of us in the official opposition with practising obstructionism. The minister carefully excluded us, the Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament, from the fulsome thanks he gave to just about anybody else within a ten miles radius of his voice last Friday. I may say that I was grateful to the minister for excluding us from his praise, because I would have been embarrassed if he had graced us in any way. But I must say that since we played some part in forcing the government to back away from much of the original white paper, I do not think that was any mean contribution that we made to tax reform in this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanfield: They seem to be rather excited, Mr. Speaker. If they were a little less excited about what I am saying, and a little more excited about treating the Canadian taxpayers carefully, they would be a little more justified in remaining in the government of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I can certainly do without the thanks of the Minister of Finance. I certainly prefer to have the thanks of Canadian people when the Canadian people realize how we fought against the birth of this monstrosity which, apparently, will occur on January 1.

Mr. Olson: Are you against the tax cuts, also?

Mr. Stanfield: Well, well. There is my friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), back in the House.

Mr. Forrestall: He is leaving us shortly. Don't be hard on him.

Mr. Danforth: He does not know any more about taxes than about agriculture.

Mr. Stanfield: The Minister of Finance has no justification for rising in the House and talking about obstructionism in connection with a bill—

Mr. Mahoney: He really got to you.

Mr. Stanfield: —to which 97 amendments were introduced on October 22; on October 29, 28 more amendments were introduced, and on November 16, 8 more amendments were introduced, some of them amendments to previous amendments. Then, the government House leader gave notice of further amendments when he introduced notice of closure. When the Minister of Finance made a speech on Friday, he indicated half a dozen areas in which further amendments will be needed. Yes, we have the absurdity of the Minister of Finance charging obstructionism under these circumstances. When one considers how much worse the bill would be than it is today if the government had not been forced to consider some of these matters, I think that the time has been very well spent indeed. The only thing we are trying to obstruct is the government's mad haste to put through, for strictly political reasons, a measure that in its totality can only