

taxpayer. It is best to have a program for the small businessmen which consists of an anti-monopoly and anti-oligopoly law and, secondly, direct capital assistance to the small businessman at a reasonable rate of interest so that he is not forever the servant of some large private corporate investor who receives a tax concession.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that our history over a period of 106 years has shown us that we cannot develop the disadvantaged areas of this country by relying on the ordinary profit motives of private enterprise because private enterprise has not found those areas profitable in the past and will not find them profitable in the future. The only way in which the disadvantaged areas of this country can be assisted and developed economically, in so far as the resources of the people, their traditions and culture are concerned, is by public investment and public help from the public treasury and wherever possible, from the provincial treasury. I remind members that the miners and steel workers of Cape Breton Island were assisted by the federal government taking over the mines and the provincial government of Nova Scotia taking over the steel industry and, incidentally, that was a Conservative government.

I say that what we require is the total reconstruction of the Canada Development Corporation to make it a public operation with large funds which are garnered through legislation which requires all corporations in Canada, public and private, financial and industrial, to invest a certain proportion of their investable capital in the Canadian Development Corporation. This corporation would be under public control and management for the precise purpose of buying back parts of the Canadian economy for the people of Canada or supplying the provinces with the revenue they need and the necessary capital to develop their economy. In this way the necessary capital could be made available to the small business entrepreneur at reasonable interest rates. These are the ways in which some real economic and social development in this country could take place. Exchanging those on my left for those on my right in government would not make the slightest difference. Canada would merely perhaps be a little duller place and perhaps members of that government a little less imaginative than sometimes the people opposite are, although I find it difficult to imagine that.

Some basic transformation is needed in the economy and the society of Canada. We will not get that from the Liberals and we will not get it from the Conservatives. So long as there are before parliament bills which would increase the old age pension, which would reduce the tax burden on the ordinary taxpayer, which promise increases to veterans in their allowances and pensions, which promise improvements in the housing legislation of this country and which promise improvements in the foreign investment situation in this country as well as other proposals, the new Democratic Party members of this House will not fall for any of the silly ploys of the Conservative party.

• (1720)

Mr. Barnett J. Danson (York North): Mr. Speaker, I was delighted with the interjection of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) in the procedural

25789—51

Effect of Budgetary Proposals

portion of this debate when he quickly dissociated himself from the drafting of the motion. I wish he were here now. I think another form of tax might be the entertainment tax which we would have to levy every time the right hon. member speaks. But I have to borrow from him because the other day he used the expression that the mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse. That is rather "corny" and a cliché now but there has been an air of expectation about this debate. There was the great question about the procedural validity of the motion. There was the waiting period of the first of the two allotted days to learn what this great motion was about which was to be brought forth. It could have been a great motion, and we really expected something constructive. However, all we got was a list of complaints which we have heard before and a question about the lack of a co-ordinated approach by this side of the House.

Then, we heard about the three-pronged attack from the hon. member from Action Canada. Instead of the two pronged A.C., we get the three pronged D.C., but the three pronged attack did not come. I was waiting and waiting. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) regurgitated his great proposals which he made during the election regarding incentives for small business which, incidentally, I think, have some merit in a small way. His ideas are not always wrong, but they are usually poorly thought out. One example is the question of the indexing provision to fight inflation which is not original; he dragged it out from somewhere else. However, our Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) made this proposal administratively possible. But to suggest that this great three-pronged attack and the co-ordinated policy of the opposition as represented by this 50 per cent write-off of the \$5,000 invested in businesses which qualify is the solution to the problems of 50 per cent of our unemployed who are under 25, is to suggest something that is far from the truth. To talk of this as being an answer to the question of Canadian ownership, or a solution to all economic problems that face this country I think puts the hon. member in his own element, the element of small business, because I have never before seen quite so small-minded an approach to such a major problem in the House.

He did not directly attack the principle of the corporate tax cut or capital cost allowance, but he sniped away. These provisions are not for the benefit of the major corporations; they are for the benefit of the small businessmen who are the backbone of industry across the country, the tens of thousands of companies, of which I have founded one, which need the incentive and a fighting chance to compete and to expand. The Leader of the Opposition is a very nice guy, no matter what he says himself; he is good, sincere and genuine and even has good Liberal ideas. It is not a matter of the government being under attack but a matter of the economy being under attack. This is not a political game; we are at economic war.

There are important considerations here that go quite beyond who stays in power in the House. We are in a highly competitive international economy. We have the problems of DISC in the United States and the international monetary crisis. We have the question of foreign investment facing us and the problems of small business, in which I am particularly interested and which were