

*Income Tax*

**Mr. Alexander:** I am sure the minister has not been advised of the facts. Does he not know that the employers are refusing referrals? The minister is talking about new incentives regarding retraining. What steps does the minister intend to take immediately to ensure that many unemployed workers are retrained so as to take up the jobs which are available? The need is becoming increasingly apparent in times of high unemployment due to government fiscal and monetary policies. What is the minister doing in order to retrain Canadians; that is what I am trying to ask?

● (1500)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. This question is of such a general nature that if the minister were prepared to give a full answer he would be here for quite some time. I do not know if the minister feels he can answer briefly before we call orders of the day.

**Mr. Andras:** Mr. Speaker, in response I would simply say that there are many measures. It is an ongoing process. If the hon. member is looking for dramatic miracles such as he and his party often try to suggest are possible, then I say that neither the Canadian public nor Canadian employers and employees will be fooled by that sort of nonsense.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would allow me to table correspondence relating to the Syncrude agreement which was requested from me by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). I think in tabling it I can clear up some of the confusion which I may inadvertently have left in some quarters of the House as to the extent of the so-called tax concessions made to that consortium.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the House agree that the minister shall have leave to table the document?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed, from Monday, February 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that Bill C-49, to amend the statute law relating to income tax, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Lawrence (p. 2977).

**Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, let me make one comment, in view of what the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) said this afternoon about unemployment in the B.C. lumber indus-

[Mr. Speaker.]

try. I suppose, as we see it, British Columbia will have to grin and bear it.

As you are aware, federal money is being used to finance the Syncrude project, as well as money of the governments of Alberta and Ontario. In my opinion the step taken by the government is a step in the right direction. After all, in the next ten years we shall need to spend \$107 billion to develop our natural resources in Canada, and we shall need to involve private companies and the federal government, as well as provincial governments, if we are to make a reality of what may be our greatest dream in the twentieth century. What has happened is just a beginning.

I do not think that, in order to participate in the venture, it is necessary for the government to control the entire industry. We have a part to play, just as the provinces have. Ultimately even provinces such as British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba will participate in natural resource development in Canada.

Last night the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) said that we should follow the examples of Britain, Italy and France, countries which have nationalized their oil industries, and nationalize our own industry. The hon. member forgot that Britain, Italy and France possess insignificant oil resources; therefore, in their cases, perhaps they were right in nationalizing them. Our situation is different. Our country has been built on free enterprise, not on welfare or the socialist system.

In our country a man has always been free to set up business and provide jobs and money for the economy. And, not only the person owning the business has made money. Therefore, I think the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie ought to agree that we cannot compare the economy of Canada with the economies of England, France and Italy. As I said, conditions here are entirely different and, hopefully, they will continue to remain different. On the other hand, governments will participate in certain ventures which require huge amounts of money. But it should not be our philosophy that we will only participate if we can control the entire industry. There is room for private industry in Canada.

I agree that the Syncrude project is a marginal enterprise. Yes, there are risks involved; yes, there are no guarantees regarding the price of oil in ten years. We do not know how much it will actually cost to produce Syncrude oil. Some estimate the cost will be \$11 per barrel. But it could be \$10 or \$12. Until production begins, we will not know. Hence we cannot give guarantees. Similarly we cannot guarantee what conditions in the world will be in 1978, when this oil is due to come on stream. We cannot say if the price of international oil will be \$4 or \$5 per barrel, so the government would be foolish to guarantee that the price of Syncrude oil will be \$11 per barrel as other suppliers may produce it for much less.

By the same token, just as we cannot guarantee what the price of oil will be in 1978, or that there will be adequate supplies in 1978, we cannot guarantee that there will be peace in the Middle East and that oil will flow to Canada and other industrialized nations from that part of the world. In other words, I think it is the government's duty to encourage the development of oil resources in Canada, and to encourage especially the development of our largest known oil resource, the Athabasca oil sands.