

continentalist. But when the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) made a speech shortly after the one made in Denver, he took a much more moderate stand.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The unilateral action taken by Canada in certain important matters of mutual defence, such as NATO and NORAD, have their reaction in the dove cotes of government in the city of Washington. When the American government responded with similar isolationism, Canada was caught on the horns of a dilemma. Here we find, as the *Financial Times* has pointed out, the government "bleating like lambs in the midst of a world cataclysm" and rushing to Washington in the hope of persuading the Americans to adopt that closer relationship and buddy-buddy attitude that Canada and spokesmen for the government were so vehemently repudiating a few months ago.

I should now like to deal with a few specific problems that are generated by this bill and to further the argument that we should delay its second reading at this time, particularly since we are considering it in the atmosphere of a pre-election Parliament. We do not want electioneering on the fundamental and basic question of financial and tax reform. The proposals put forward in Bill C-259 are out of touch with the needs of western Canada. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) last night dealt with this subject. He is one of the few members supporting the government who has taken part in this debate. Either government supporters have been completely brainwashed into thinking that this is the best possible legislation to deal with the matter, or they have been told to be silent because the government wants to rush this confused, complex and totally inadequate piece of legislation through the House. I see the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Faulkner) shakes his head. I hope he will enter this debate, because we want to hear viewpoints from all parts of Canada on this matter and he represents a constituency that ought to be greatly concerned about some proposals in the legislation.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, speaking as a Manitoban, spoke not as one indulging in basic criticisms but as an apologist for the government. He said, as has the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) on many occasions, that the federal government is neglecting the interests of western Canada, that it is not in tune with the needs of western Canada but that it is doing its best under the circumstances. I will take a much stronger stand and suggest that the Trudeau government is completely out of touch with the needs of this important part of Canada. This has been reflected at the polls in recent provincial elections. The Liberal leader in Manitoba has re-echoed these sentiments. For the past several months he has been preaching for a call. He is leading a party in the legislature of Manitoba that has been reduced to three members.

Mr. Greene: What happened to the Tories out there?

Mr. Dinsdale: The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) asks what happened to the Tories. I presume he is interested in hearing the reply.

Mr. Greene: Oh, yes.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, the explanation is quite simple. I would think that most of the Liberals voted NDP in the 1969 election, with the result that the NDP representation in the Manitoba legislature rose from a rather insignificant number of members to become the government with a very slim majority. They had about one more seat than the Conservative official opposition. I trust that answers the minister's question. The leader of that province's Liberal party does not even have a seat in the legislature. This is a most unhappy state of affairs because it inevitably results in political provincialism, and nothing is worse for the interests of national unity in this country.

Although Mr. Asper has no seat in the legislature and therefore no platform in the legislature, he is a well-known commentator on tax matters. I trust the government is reading Mr. Asper's writings in the Toronto papers respecting the legislation now before the House. He described the white paper in a major critique as "the Benson iceberg". That description applies with equal force and validity to the bill before the House. It is still an iceberg. The old figure of speech really says that what appears on the surface is only a small part of what is involved; it is just the tip of the iceberg that you see.

From my reading of the comments of experts and professionals, they are saying, "We do not understand what the government is trying to do in this legislation." The Canadian Bar Association has said this; chartered accounts have said it. Experts who know something about this field are saying, "Beware; there are all sorts of booby-traps in the legislation". In these circumstances members of the House ought to vote for a second, serious, sober review of the legislation.

One reason it militates against western Canada is that it will destroy the family farm. The economic basis of the prairie farming economy has been seriously undermined in the past several years by Liberal administrations in this country. I travelled about my constituency during the summer months and learned that there has been tinkering and experimenting to such an extent that farmers who have been farming for years are throwing up their hands and saying they can no longer survive; the policies of the government make it impossible for them to remain economically solvent.

There has been an improvement in grain sales recently. This is vital to the prosperity of the Canadian economy. These sales normally would result in an upsurge in the economy and in a more buoyant feeling on the part of prairie farmers. That has not happened. These sales have made no impact because farmers have been living for the past two or three years on cash advances, and the first charge on any grain delivered in a period of greater activity in terms of grain deliveries is upon the grain delivered. So farmers are running to keep pace with the unhappy economic position in which they find themselves.

I hope we have a debate on this matter and cover that point specifically, especially in view of the extremely precarious position of long-established prairie farms and grain farmers in particular. The government is breaking the law. I cannot for the life of me think why it will not pay out the \$81 million, I think it is, which it is obligated to pay to prairie farmers under the Temporary Wheat