

After 20 years it is strange to see federal funds being spent to pave an airstrip in my riding—we are grateful for it—only to face the imposition of this 10 per cent tax which is a hardship on pilots and others using aircraft in their business. If it is luxury we are taxing, let us tax luxury. If it is business and items such as the small pleasure boat and aircraft, and if energy is our main concern, let us attack the consumers of energy.

I may be treading on some toes but I should like to suggest to the minister that he compare the amount of energy consumed by small boats on Kootenay Lake—Comprising hundreds of them last year it was only 32,000 gallons—with the amount consumed by enormous mobile homes travelling the highways at four miles to the gallon—or four gallons to the mile is more likely in some cases. Maybe somebody has adjusted the carburetor and is actually getting four miles to the gallon! Now I will probably get letters from that particular industry, but these things are major consumers and wasters of energy and they have not been touched. Let us tap them with 5 per cent, maybe. The matters covered in Bill C-40 are addressed to energy. I think the clause with reference to boats and the clause with reference to aircraft should be reconsidered.

**Mr. Anderson:** Madam Chairman, the fact that I do not agree 100 per cent with the Minister of Finance on the question of the excise tax on boats and aircraft does not diminish my personal respect for a man whom I consider to be one of the most able finance ministers in the free world today.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An hon. Member:** Are you sneaking in a paid political announcement?

**Mr. Anderson:** When looking at the economies of other countries I think this fact becomes evident even to those members sitting on the other side. Madam Chairman, after saying a few kind words about the minister—

**An hon. Member:** Now tell him.

**Mr. Anderson:**—I should like to comment on this matter of an excise tax on boats. I feel it is not a regional item but something which concerns all provinces. The boat industry is important to the maritime region, and it is important to the central part of Canada such as Ontario and Quebec. Even in Saskatchewan they have stoneboats and I understand that in Alberta they use boats to cross their pools of oil.

In the province of British Columbia, of course, boating is not a luxury, it is a way of life. In British Columbia as well as in many northern parts of Canada—and I consider anything 100 miles north of the 49th parallel to be northern Canada—boats are used for transporting children to school, people to work, and as a means of providing continuity in industry. They are used in logging operations, by trappers, and by so many people that they cannot be considered a luxury item.

When boats are used as a luxury item I think the minister is correct in imposing a tax. However, I believe that in 99 per cent of Canada where they are a necessary

### *Adjournment Debate*

item, a tax at this stage in our economy would be the same as taxing bread and milk 10 per cent or 15 per cent.

I do not wish to be parochial, Madam Chairman, but unfortunately our provincial government has not provided roads in the riding I represent and, as a result, boats are a major means of transportation. Any form of taxation would increase the difficulty that people already suffer in regard to inflation, and would affect the industries that have been carefully set up and nurtured over the past ten or 20 years which cannot afford a tax at this time. As the saying goes, when a man is down you do not kick him, and when an industry is not as healthy as it has been in recent years surely it should be our object to encourage that industry and provide incentives to make it stronger.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but as it is now ten o'clock it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to consider this bill again at the next sitting of the House.

Progress reported.

• (2200)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### FINANCE—OFFER OF MORTGAGE LOANS BY ARAB COUNTRIES—SUGGESTED REFERENCE TO DEPARTMENT FOR APPROVAL

**Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe):** Madam Speaker, I rise this evening as the result of an inadequate answer which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) gave yesterday to a question and supplementary that I asked. I am sorry the minister has not chosen to stay in the House and answer in a more satisfactory way the questions I put to him yesterday. I say that because I feel the present minister, who has occupied his present portfolio for almost three years, has many things to answer for in this House.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) obviously has not long been a member of this House, judging from the tone of his recent remarks, and he has obviously not reviewed the minister's record or he would not have spoken this evening in such glowing terms about the minister.

During the three years the minister has been in office, inflation has risen from 2.9 per cent in 1971 to the current rate of 10.9 per cent. Government spending has jumped by 67 per cent during the minister's tenure in office. Yesterday I attempted to ask why this is happening. I asked, for example, if it is true that he has said in private meetings with people in industry that his cabinet colleagues vote him down every time he tries to restrain government spending programs. I asked if the efforts of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) to obtain about \$1