

the total labour force itself cannot grow as rapidly as in other regions until or unless employment in the secondary sector can take up the slack caused by slow growth of employment in the primary sector, the farming community. I suggest that when we look at tax concessions we should look very hard at encouraging to the maximum degree manufacturing processing and completion of our farm goods, in much the same way as our hon. friend suggested in respect of fish products in his part of the world.

Our economy has been tied into agriculture for a long time and I do not believe it is turning into a liability, as many people suggest. We should place more accent on manufacture and finishing of agricultural goods. This could go a long way toward providing a key for the future growth and prosperity of our part of the world.

In taking a hard look at tax concessions, the deliberate tax concessions built into our tax policy as a matter of regional economic expansion, let us not forget what is already being attempted under manpower training programs and DREE. If we can do this in respect of raw materials, mining and for Canada as a whole, we can surely have a good, hard look at doing it in particular cases in particular regions through encouraging regional growth.

● (9:30 p.m.)

After all, that is what DREE is doing or is attempting to do. It is doing a good job and it is not neglecting the Prairies. In 1969 and 1970 DREE put 26 per cent of its total outlay into the Prairies, that is, \$52 million. Of that amount, \$13 million went to our province of Manitoba. So it is wrong for the prophets of gloom and doom and the professional organizers of some parties to say that this party or this government does not understand or does not care for the west. It spent \$52 million there, plus a great amount on housing, for which of course the government of Manitoba is taking credit but 90 per cent of that is federal money through CMHC in almost all cases. This federal government is doing more for the west than did any other federal government. It must try to do more; it must continue its efforts to understand the particular problems of the west and it must not allow itself to be stampeded by all the noises it hears from time to time from lesser elements that happen to hold office in other parts of the country.

There is nothing wrong with the DREE approach. I encourage it and I welcome it, but I think it should be re-examined. If you are spending \$52 million on the Prairies, would it not be better to give \$52 million worth of tax concessions to secondary industry to produce certain results which you wish to achieve, and leave it to individual businessmen to take the initiative and to get going? It is something worth examining. At the same time I suggest that we take a very hard look at this aspect of multinational corporations and subsidiary corporations. In our tax bill we have good proposals in this regard, but I think we should look at them hard before adopting them finally on a clause by clause basis.

Mr. Benjamin: We have been looking at them.

Income Tax Act

Mr. Osler: But you cannot understand them. There is no use in your looking at them. I am speaking to people who are responsible and who can understand them. We have had opposition days for years, and they do no good. I am talking to the government. You people have made no constructive criticisms. Someone has to. This is a job for the backbenchers of this party, and we welcome it, both in caucus and in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Osler: I repeat what I have said. In general, I congratulate the minister for his bill, and in particular I think we should look with a great deal of interest at every clause as it goes through. I urge that from the point of view of my region we consider the possibility of putting DREE funds to better use in respect of tax concessions.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, following as I do the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler), I cannot speak without making a few comments on some of the things he said. He said again and again that the debate we are conducting at present is about legislation which will bring about tax reform in this country. If anybody outside this House were to characterize these proposed changes in the tax structure as tax reform, I would immediately say they were lying. I know that it is unparliamentary to use that kind of language about things which are said in this House, so I simply say that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has misrepresented completely what this bill proposes to do.

Mr. Osler: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Osler: I rise on a point of order just to point out that if I thought the hon. gentleman was serious and had thought through what he was saying, I would raise a question of privilege.

Mr. Orlikow: I was never more serious than when I said that while this bill may change the tax structure in the country, there is nothing in the way of tax reform in it. The hon. member tried to create the impression that only the wild-eyed radicals in this part of the House were critical of this bill.

Mr. Osler: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that I used the word "radical". Under no circumstances would I call these Tories radical.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair has no alternative but to rule out the point of order because it is a point of debate.

Mr. Orlikow: The financial columnist of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, the anchor, the flagship of that great newspaper chain started in Winnipeg, F.P. Publications, Ronald Anderson, in discussing the legislation which we