

facing several sectors of the agricultural community today. The initiative for legislation in the House must come from the Government. Parliament cannot act to solve these problems with legislation or budgetary items which are not before it. Unless there is some action the situation will grow even more acute throughout the winter and spring months and we will see bankruptcies rise to the level projected by the Farm Credit Corporation. Mr. Speaker, there should have been action on these items in the Speech from the Throne or in the economic statement.

The figure projected by the Farm Credit Corporation of 1,000 or 1,700 bankruptcies is not just an empty statistic. It represents farms and farm families. It represents hopes and dreams which will be destroyed unless the Government acts in this first session of the Thirty-third Parliament.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Are there any questions or comments?

**Mr. MacDougall:** Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), one of the few Members on the other side who returned to the House after the election.

I marvel at the Hon. Member for Algoma expecting us on this side, after a matter of two months, to be able to address all the problems which the prior government caused in the country. Would the Member for Algoma tell us whether he himself or his Party is in favour of pensions and baby bonuses for those in Canada who are making over \$100,000 a year? Is he himself or his Party in favour of having individuals in that wage category receive that type of benefit?

• (1240)

**Mr. Foster:** Mr. Speaker, what we really marvel at is the change in what the Prime Minister was saying in the election campaign. At that time he said that these programs were a sacred trust and were untouchable. Suddenly they are no longer a sacred trust; apparently only medicare is a sacred trust. We marvel at the undoubted change that has occurred during the last two or three months.

**Mr. Baker:** Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the Hon. Member on his speech. However, I think he made one unintentional error with respect to the Summer Canada Program. He said that some 500 or 600 students would lose their jobs during the summer. Would the Hon. Member correct that statement? Perhaps this figure only applies to his riding, because it is an \$85 million program. At approximately \$1,000 per student, it represents 80,000 students.

Could the Hon. Member give his opinion as to the rationale of a government that would discontinue direct job creation for students in high unemployment areas such as the Hon. Member's riding? What kind of wicked, cruel rationale would a government follow to take such a move? Does he think that the Government will have to turn around in the spring, reverse that policy and bring back the exact same program that the Liberal Government had last summer?

#### *The Address—Mr. Foster*

**Mr. Foster:** Mr. Speaker, let me clarify for the Hon. Member that it was 500 or 600 jobs in the Algoma-Manitoulin area and not the whole country. Those jobs will be sorely missed. Many of these students are from low-income families and many are native students from the 12 reserves in my constituency. Many of them have an opportunity to go to university in spite of their modest backgrounds, but they will not now have that opportunity.

Many communities depend on students for their tourism promotion, community betterment, recreational programs and many other projects which the municipal governments cannot afford. They depend on this Summer Canada Program.

I would not attempt to explain the rationale of the Government for cutting out this program. If I were to speculate, I would speculate that the hue and cry from students across the country, including those from constituencies of Members on all sides, will be so great by the spring that the program will be reinstated. This is a relatively modest expenditure and if my constituency is a typical example, it seems to be a cruel, unfair and unjust action to put 500 or 600 students into idleness and to foreclose on their opportunities to return to college or university. I certainly hope that the Government will reverse its policy with respect to this program. It gave no forewarning during the election campaign that it was planning to cut out the student program.

It would have been interesting to see how Progressive Conservative Members would have campaigned on that policy of cutting out student employment programs. I would have been interested to see what support such a policy would have had from the young Progressive Conservatives.

I welcome the question from the Hon. Member from Newfoundland because I did not go into any of the detail which his question allowed me to give in this debate.

**Mr. Nickerson:** Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to set the record straight. In his presentation the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) said that Revenue Canada had ceased to give advance rulings on the tax consequences of certain arrangements. This is not the case. Revenue Canada continues to give those advance rulings, with one particular exception. That is the one with which the Hon. Member is concerned. It involves the use of a limited partnership for purposes that were not contemplated under the Income Tax Act.

According to the Act, limited partnership contemplated individuals forming partnerships. In the case with which the Hon. Member is concerned, there are two large corporations that would like to form a limited partnership. That is why an advance ruling has not yet been given in this particular instance.

However, I would agree with the Hon. Member that it would be advantageous, especially for the potential new employees in his riding, were the Department of National Revenue to be able to give that advance ruling in the near future.