

that would at least provide parity incentives for Canadian investors in the oil and gas industries. Perhaps the only solution to this problem is that tax laws in Canada should provide the same basis for at least fair competition with foreign concerns. This objective could be achieved in one of two ways, namely, provide a shelter for Canadian companies or change tax laws that would provide a true incentive for Canadians to participate in risk ventures and the ultimate development of our own resources, regardless of the tax position of these industries relative to other industries in Canada.

At a time when economic nationalism was the byword, Mr. Speaker, the socialists talked about it every day. Where are they now? Did Mr. Nixon scare them off? It is all right to talk about economic nationalism because it gets a few votes, but on analysis economic nationalism is not nearly as attractive with its accompanying hardships. I know a socialist who earns \$27,000 a year and whose wife earns \$10,000, making the family income in the neighbourhood of \$37,000 before taxes. A free car and expense account bring the total closer to \$40,000. With that kind of salary it is nice to be political and espouse the virtues of socialism, but don't cut the socialist's salary to the level of those he is trying to convert: and they say Carter did not go far enough! Economic nationalism is the order of the day. It is nice to be a socialist at times because that is the kind of talk that puts them on the pedestal. Move a socialist out of a government job and put him into business for himself and all at once he becomes a free enterprise.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Who appointed him?

Mr. Skoreyko: If the minister does not know that by now, there is no point my telling him. Surely the government knows as well as anyone else that in a democracy the most destructive political force is communism and the greatest threat to free enterprise is socialism. Is it not strikingly strange, Mr. Speaker, that this government has set up the Canadian Development Corporation—which cannot get out of the diaper stage—talks about buying Canada back from foreign investors, and then proposes a tax structure which will make every taxpayer tax poor? It seems to me that at a time when Canadians want to own more of their country tax cuts would have been more in order.

What about unemployment in relation to the bill? In that area this government has little to be proud of. Half a million people are out of work, and this government wishes to impose a capital gains tax, increase taxation generally and buy Canada back, to say nothing of the massive expenditures proposed by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) in connection with unemployment benefits.

Is there not something wrong when we consider the money we have wasted—millions on the Company of Young Canadians over the years and \$68 million on the Opportunities for Youth program which was bungled in a mad desire to create something for youth today because there was no other way the government could find jobs for them: it is a nightmare that the minister will be living with for a long time.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: He is living with lots of other nightmares in the cabinet.

Mr. Skoreyko: Then the government adopted the recommendations of the B and B commission in one of the most divisive pieces of legislation in the history of the country; it was not surpassed even by the flag and unification issues. Mr. Speaker, 48 pieces of legislation received royal assent before we broke off for the summer holidays and not one piece of it was designed to assist businessmen, the unemployed, farmers, fishermen, lumbermen or people like that.

Mr. Baldwin: Shame! That was terrible.

Mr. Skoreyko: I wonder if some hon. members on the other side of the House know what it is like to be unemployed. You may have a family, you may have to make car payments, mortgage payments and probably furniture payments, and have no prospect of a job; you lack training and there is nobody to look to. Then the government says to you, "We did not promise you anything in 1968," which really means, I suppose, "We do not have to do anything for you." The fact is that the government has a responsibility to the people of Canada. It must refer this legislation to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs and allow the committee all the time that is needed to hear from witnesses and from all Canadians wishing to give evidence before the committee. If the committee should recommend the withdrawal of the legislation, it ought to be withdrawn.

[Translation]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I felt it was my duty to take part in the debate concerning the motion on second reading of Bill C-259 entitled "An Act to amend the Income Tax Act and to make certain provisions and alterations in the statute law related to or consequential upon the amendments to that Act".

This bill is dense in more ways than one because its 710 pages are very difficult to understand and its complex contents has given rise to the rightful indignation of several co-operatives and Canadian taxpayers. It certainly deserves our special consideration.

I would like to deal more particularly with certain provisions of the bill concerning the co-operative movement in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, with reason, the co-operative movements in Canada are very concerned and dissatisfied with the provisions of Bill C-259. Let us state first of all, so that there be no misunderstanding, that the Canadian co-operative movements are not asking the federal government for any special treatment and, secondly, that they want, in all fairness, to be recognized for what they are.

On reading some provisions of this bill, one wonders if the government has understood the meaning and the definition of a co-operative. The Canadian co-operative movement is a growing financial force in Canada, its importance being on the increase both economically and socially. The Canadian co-operative movement belongs to its members, and not only to the small group of people who are at its head. It belongs to our fellow-citizens from Canada and Quebec, and not to the Americans, nor to foreigners, not to Mr. Nixon nor to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). It truly belongs to Canadians. It is a movement that derives its strength from its base, from its