Mr. Domm: They are upset because there is substantive proof, and an indication by this present government in concert with the New Democratic Party in Canada, that together they are going to adopt the kinds of policies which will move our nation, our country grown through the free enterprise system, into a form of socialistic government where we can take from those who have and give to those who have not, with no consideration of reward, incentive, legislation or tax measures that would add to the incentive of the free enterprise system.

Last night during the debate a member of the New Democratic Party used as an example of the kinds of policies they would like to see in place in Canada the case of a hairdresser in Hamilton who was finding it difficult to pay taxes. The very simple and basic answer the New Democratic Party would give, and this is recorded in my response last night was: can you not find some company, a major corporation, from which you can take that money—he was directing these remarks to previous statements by one of my colleagues—and pay the taxes for that person who is having a great deal of difficulty making that $6,000 payment? I remind the member from Hamilton—

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Domm: Mr. Chairman, it is my turn, and I have 20 minutes.

The Chairman: Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain on a point of order.

Mr. Deans: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the member is attempting to put words into my mouth. He is stating I said something last night which I did not say. I ask him to point to that portion of *Hansard* in which I said anything even vaguely resembling what he has now said, and if he cannot find it, withdraw it.

The Chairman: The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. Domm: The answer by the New Democratic member, the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain, to the problem of the hairdresser who found it difficult to pay this tax on $6,000 was: why cannot this Liberal government find that money to make it more easy for that constituent not to have to pay that tax? In reality the reason that hairdresser cannot pay tax on $6,000 income is because this government, in concert with the New Democratic Party of Canada, has failed to introduce policies, tax measures and incentives that would allow the free enterprise system to produce on its own. Free of government intervention in the marketplace it could produce on its own the profits necessary to generate the funds for this government to pay the bills. However, it insists, with the help of the New Democratic Party, on introducing policies in Canada which inflame government requirements for funds in order that it can satisfy this insatiable desire to spend money. We expect in Bill C-54 income tax measures which will encourage small businesses to function in order to produce the necessary profits.

We had hoped there would be some relief for the farmers in respect of capital gains tax in Bill C-54. What in reality is happening under this tax measure, Bill C-54, is that farmers are going to be forced to sell their farms to pay all the accumulated capital gains tax which could amount to a sum greater than a farm's selling price. The non-exemption for farmers under the capital gains tax has been a major factor in the decline in the number of Canadian farms. Farmers are being forced to add the cost of their tax to the selling price, and this has led to immensely high set-up costs for new farms.

The Clark government would have allowed farmers to roll over the proceeds of a farm sale into an RRSP. Whatever the Prime Minister might think of it, Canadian farmers are looking ruefully now for some assistance. They have major questions of concern, as does the public, as to why the government has eliminated the farm community from assistance through RRSPs to avoid capital gains tax. Members opposite in the government will answer that they can put it on hold, that they do not have to pay that capital gains tax if they hand it down from father to son. However, it just sits there and, with inflation growing at the rate it is today, and with the devalued dollar like it never has been before, reality will fall on those farmers maybe two generations from now in that they will have to pay that tax.

We had hoped for an energy tax credit as well for the low and middle-income groups. I can remember not a year ago that members opposite, when they were in opposition, and NDP members as well, just a little over a year ago, were asking for some assistance for low and middle-income groups in order to offset some of their increased costs of energy. In the Crosbie budget, defeated by the NDP and the Liberals, we had offered an energy tax credit to assist every individual on low and middle incomes in Canada in offsetting stress and strain brought to bear by increased energy prices. That was and is denied. It is not in the present tax measures brought forward either in the budget or in this new income tax legislation.

• (1520)

I say to the members of the New Democratic Party and of the Liberal Party of Canada, which I like to refer to as the "Liberal-Democratic Party of Canada", that we need to introduce into our economy systems of taxation which will add incentives to businesses and encourage the construction industry so that homes can be built to supply the needs of all those people who are finding it virtually impossible to acquire homes today.

As a Conservative government we introduced a mortgage interest deduction. We brought it in, but it was turned down. It was not passed. Not all Liberals voted against the mortgage interest deduction. Some of them had the guts to stand up in this House and support mortgage interest deductions. What happened was that the New Democratic Party members did not want mortgage interest deductions. They did not want to help low and middle-income people acquire homes. They felt it would only benefit the rich or those who have, and that it would not help those who have not.

I remind the members of the New Democratic Party to my left that there are many low and middle-income people in