

policies for agriculture which will meet these circumstances. All the tax bill does for agriculture is devise new methods of imposing new taxes on the person who is trying to survive on the farm, as well as on the co-operatives which he has built and used as an extension of his farming and marketing power. The slowdown in agriculture and farming in significant parts of Canada gives rise to unemployment. The government is attempting to persuade us that this situation will be met with the money they will make available for loans or grants for crash programs this winter.

I fail to see, however, where the planned thrust to get the economy going emerges in this total program. Indeed, I think its real shortcoming is the fact that it is not a total program but a patchwork or an ad hoc program. The whole tax approach is patchwork and the program is a patchwork. The government does not say to us in clear terms that collectively these programs will correct the unemployment situation. In the last two or three days I have listened to questions put to the government asking what their objective is and what they think these programs will achieve by way of reducing unemployment. The answers do not come through clearly; rather, there is evasion. This is the thing that disturbs me about the whole approach of the government.

Last night I was reading the *Country Guide*, a magazine of some standing published in western Canada by one of the major grain companies. In an article entitled "Agriculture's Stake in the New U.S. Economic Policy" our position is examined. One would expect that when the government brings forth a policy for the coming winter or the longer term it would take agriculture's stake into account, but it does not. I am sure we are looking at the same thing on the employment side. When people in my city become unemployed and start looking for jobs they find themselves against a blank wall. When I ask them if they went to the manpower office they ask to what purpose. They will go to the Unemployment Insurance Commission or answer advertisements in the newspaper but when I ask if they look for training they ask, training for what? There are reports and charges that people become professionals at dodging from one training slot to another.

My main purpose this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, is to persuade this government to take an over-all look at the needs of the Canadian economy and to build the forward thrust and confidence we so badly need to enable ordinary business to invest with confidence and so that the co-operatives, which are an important part of the total business in my area, will know where they stand. At present they are wondering if they are going to have to change their structure in order to comply with these new tax proposals. They should have confidence that they can continue to meet the demands made upon them by the people who created and use them. We need a forward thrust and a real motive in the economy toward employing people and creating the things that we can use and the things that we want. If we could get this kind of co-ordination then, as we go through this tax package, hopefully we could bring in some amendments which would make it a worthwhile and workable document.

Income Tax Act

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Chairman, when I spoke on this measure the other day I dealt with a number of items, some of which I consider to be anomalies in the bill. I said I hoped the government would take into consideration some of the recommendations made by the opposition. Most of us on this side of the House are concerned about this massive 707 page bill which is before us because, not only is it complicated in its makeup, but it represents a danger to the Canadian taxpayer. There is an absence in this bill of provisions which we on this side of the House have been advocating. We are concerned about this.

I suppose I might place on the record some of the omissions about which we are concerned. We are concerned about the absence of provisions to stimulate the resource development industry. We are concerned about the absence of provisions to create funds for land acquisition, to guarantee low income homes in the country which every politician in Canada talks about but about which nobody does anything. We are concerned about the ramifications in Bill C-259 in respect of shifting the tax burden. When I talk about shifting the tax burden I should say I believe there is a good clause in this bill which would relieve thousands of taxpayers of the small amount of tax they have been paying in the past. I believe they will appreciate that.

I think it is disgraceful, however, that the very rich should, under this measure, have their taxes reduced. In order for the government to continue to bring in a given amount of money required to run the nation the tax load is shifting to the middle income groups. This no longer represents the petty larceny of which this government has been guilty on so many occasions. This, in my opinion, is grand larceny in its extreme. In respect of the high inflationary measures this government has undertaken in the recent past I was hoping something would be incorporated in Bill C-259 to correct some of these mistakes. What has the government done in terms of stimulating certain industries, particularly the resource development industry, and especially the mining industry? I am not too close to the industry itself although I know a number of people in it. The anti-inflationary measures adopted by this government a year ago have created chaos in the mining industry, particularly in the Vancouver area. A number of companies in that region of Canada today lie dormant awaiting some action on the part of the government so that at least they will be offered a little encouragement through having funds made available to them at reasonable interest rates for purposes of further expansion and development.

Speculative investment in the mining industry has been curtailed because of the government's action in slowing down the economy generally. I know of two or three well-known Canadian companies with holdings in Northern British Columbia, which also have holdings in Brazil and Chile, which have closed down their British Columbia operations and moved into other parts of the world in order to expand their operations, notwithstanding the fact that the political climate might not be as stable as it is on the North American continent. What then have the anti-inflationary measures of this government done? I suggest the resource industry is the heaviest loser, not only in terms of production but also in terms of lack of incentive