

*Income Tax Act*

either of reducing the supply and forcing up the market price, or of paying support prices to the producers so the producers would not suffer a complete loss and possibly bankruptcy. The government took the first course and the Canadian consumer is now footing the bill, which would not have been the case had the government adequately supported the market.

Instead of making gifts to corporations the government should do something for taxpayers. If the government were to pay support prices to the primary producers, they could then safely produce food for the nation in quantity. But the government is guided in this area by the same policies it has adopted to deal with unemployment. The government wants to squeeze the guy at the bottom, and it is doing so. The government is adopting the policy of scarcity planning, which means someone at the bottom is continually being squeezed, which is the very essence of an economy that is planned on scarcity. This is the case in the beef and poultry industries. This is the policy we had in the grain industry under the Lift program, the policy of making food scarce so that the price rises. How ridiculous!

The government then set up a prices review committee to examine the situation. What happened was that a few years back we set up a task force on agriculture, and then there were people in government foolish enough to follow their advice. As a result we had poor planning in respect of agriculture.

● (1600)

I suggest at this point of time the government is putting its money on the wrong horse; it is giving assistance to the wrong people. It is of interest to note the amount of time the minister devoted to the subject of food in his address on June 14. He said:

This is essentially a demand situation involving an imbalance in supply and demand of agricultural products and of world products.

That is quite so and that is a fairly good assessment of the situation, but what were the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) and the minister in charge of the wheat board, the three men who could do something to bring that imbalance into balance, doing about the situation?

I have carefully read the speeches of the Minister of Agriculture, yet I have looked in vain to see one bit of hope for the Canadian farmer and the Canadian people. He tells the Canadian consumer that food is a bargain, but I do not know that he has convinced the Canadian consumer of that as yet. They are hopefully awaiting the farmer getting into full production in order that food will become plentiful and prices will again take a nosedive and I suggest that then the farmer will be picking himself off the floor as he was in 1969-70. Why have those on that side of the House not the decency to say to the farmers that if they produce the government will guarantee a price? I am sure if they did that the farmers would maintain the required production, and that such a program would cost much less than is being contributed to the coffers of the corporations as a result of this bill, if it is ever passed.

There are many things we need in this country today, and there are many ways we could use this money to

[Mr. Gleave.]

better advantage. The Congress of Canadian Women wrote a letter recently to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in which they described some of the circumstances affecting the Indians in northern Ontario. The letter is signed by Hilda Murray, National Secretary for the Congress of Canadian Women. If 75 per cent of the things stated there are true, the situation is a disgrace to the Canadian people. It is stated in this letter:

Most of the reserves and settlements I have visited have a very poor quality of drinking water. These waters are contaminated with various pollutants and impurities. They are usually advised to boil the drinking water or else add bleach to it.

I wonder how the ordinary Canadian would like to throw some bleach into his drinking water to give it flavour? The letter further states:

They live in sub-standard housing, which is not suitable for the harsh, northern sub-zero temperatures. The houses are in very bad repair, leaking roofs, poor insulation . . . log foundations.

I am sure these Indians did not live under these conditions before we developed the area, and I am sure they were not living in these conditions before the mining companies got there. We have created these conditions, yet we are now giving benefits to the wrong people. These are the people who need the benefits, and they are Canadians because we made them Canadians. The letter goes on to state:

Another locality has a nurse and doctor only every six months. A 77 year old veteran gets \$15 a month. Another 72 old age pensioner has additional \$16.

The letter further describes the fact that babies are born who are not registered and that transportation by air is so expensive that patients are only flown out if they are deathly ill. The letter states that these are only a few of the problems which face these people. These are the people who should be getting benefits, and these are the things about which we, as Canadians, should be concerned.

We could improve transportation into northern Ontario, northern Alberta, northern Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories. We could make transportation cheap and economic if we wanted to do so. We could use some of the people who are not working to carry out some of these things. If a mining company requires a road, we find some way of providing one. If a company wants to move in a string of bulldozers to tear up one side of a mountain we find the money to build that road. The only thing I can say to the Minister of Finance and this government is that they are putting their money on the wrong horse. There will be a day of reckoning for Canadians because of this kind of decision.

**Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, for the most part when dealing with legislation in the House of Commons one tends to be, and in fact should be, critical only of the policies, portions of the legislation or of the government for bringing forward such legislation. However, in this case it is almost impossible not to be genuinely critical of the man behind the legislation, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner). One tends to be critical because it is quite obvious this legislation is his personal handiwork, and in many areas he does not have the confidence of many members of Cabinet, and certainly many backbenchers of the party opposite. They will vote for it as they are a well-disciplined group of followers, but what