

Income Tax Act

Toronto almost every week end and I think it is 24 or 25 miles from one end of the metropolitan area to the other. I do not suppose the government would contemplate for one moment suggesting that if the rate of growth in the east end of Toronto was less rapid than in the west end, special concessions should be given to industry to locate in that part of the metropolitan area which was not progressing as fast as the other. Yet, apparently, this is what has happened in the case of Brantford. The cities of Galt, Guelph, Brantford, Woodstock and Kitchener form part of the same industrial complex in the area concerned, an area of just about the same size as Toronto or Montreal. Merely because it so happened that there were separate national employment offices in these various cities, it was decided it would be possible to designate one city while passing over another. I can tell the hon. gentleman that labour flows freely between these various industrial cities. A great many people who work in one large factory in my own city come from Brantford. Many people in my own district work in Kitchener. The distances involved are not nearly as great as they are between one end of Toronto and the other.

In fact, this whole area is an industrial complex itself and its cities and towns are rapidly growing closer and closer together. I say that this would not apply to places like Windsor, Elliot Lake or Cornwall and other areas which have been designated. These towns are well removed from other industrial centres, and I do not think anyone can find any objection, except the one I pointed out in the first part of my remarks, to these places being designated. But when you take one part of what is essentially one industrial complex and single it out for preference as opposed to the other parts, I find it very offensive and unreasonable.

I realize the government has put itself in a rather difficult position; I think all hon. members realize this. The city of Brantford was designated an area to receive assistance, and it is indeed difficult for the government to repeal this decision. Any reasonable hon. member would accept that. But there is something else the government can do to help matters, and that is this. Since I have pointed out that this whole area of Galt, Guelph, Kitchener, Woodstock, Waterloo, and so on, is all part of the same industrial complex, to make things a little fairer the government could very well designate the whole area as one to receive these tax advantages. In addition to incidentally helping the growth of the

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

area it would certainly do a great deal to disperse industry, instead of its locating constantly in the city of Toronto, which as many people have pointed out is perhaps a socially undesirable thing. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) looks a little shocked at that, but I think we have all heard hon. members from his side of the house in the past say that it is probably a good thing to disperse industry so that cities do not get bigger and bigger while other places do not grow at all. I do not think the minister will disagree with that. I have no objection to the city of Toronto. I am very fond of it; I received part of my education there, and I like the city and its people. But I think he could hardly object to the proposition that it is socially desirable to prevent a city from getting too large, a condition which breeds all sorts of undesirable things.

Mr. Gordon: Would the hon. member permit a question from one who happens to come from Toronto. I am sure he did not mean to imply that it was socially undesirable for people to live in Toronto, did he?

Mr. Nesbitt: That all depends, Mr. Speaker, on what one might think was socially undesirable. Perhaps I have been misunderstood, but what I meant was that I think it is socially undesirable in any province to have one city become increasingly large with a heavy concentration of population in one area, which leads to a number of social evils which you do not get in smaller places.

There are those who have been unkind enough to point out that they think certain municipalities have been discriminated against, and this is attributed mostly to governments. I have heard it suggested in a very unkind way that the special designation of Brantford was a rather refined method of political patronage, in view of the political representation of Brantford. I do not think I can agree with that because I am sure that is not the case. From what we have heard lately in this house I do not think the government could ever be accused of refined political patronage in view of the crude methods we have recently heard of. I think that disposes of that argument.

I should like to deal with some remarks made by the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) when he replied to a question from me, concerning unemployment in the city of Brantford, during the course of debate on a previous occasion. I pointed out that because of the relocation of the Massey-Ferguson plant at Brantford, which is perhaps the principal industry in Brantford, there had been a large amount of temporary unemployment.