

Natural Resources—Development

and I repeat what I have said on previous occasions—that the time has come—and, certainly the Gordon report indicates and emphasizes this—for the entire tax structure in Canada to be overhauled with a view to providing encouragement to the promotion of primary and secondary industries in our country.

Promoters, investors and those who venture in risk enterprises should have precisely the same advantage with regard to taxation as exists in the United States, for unless this is provided here in Canada, Canadian promoters and investors are placed in a secondary position, a condition of affairs that no one can possibly justify. And in making this survey of the tax structure of Canada, federal, provincial and municipal steps should be taken to assure by the necessary changes in taxation, many of which are recommended in the Gordon report, provision for the encouragement of Canadian corporations. In addition to that, the provinces and municipalities, with their own responsibilities for development, should be assured of sources of revenue whereby a more equitable share of tax yields would be made available to them, thereby permitting them to discharge their full responsibilities in the direction necessary for the proper development of this country. These are but a few of the matters that will be considered during the course of this debate.

We look back on what was said in July, 1956 with a considerable amount of appreciation when we realize that many of the things which we advocated now find themselves in the Gordon commission report. I again ask the government this: what are you going to do about it? Are you going to let the report die a natural death, or are you going to act on the evidence that has been gathered by this commission if Canada is to achieve its proper development? Is action to be taken now? If not, why not?

There is no reason why measures should not be introduced at this session in connection with taxation which will assure that the handicaps under which Canadian investors operate today will be removed and Canadians will thereby be encouraged to share in our national development to a greater degree than has been possible under the hobbling influence of taxation measures at present on the statute books. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Green (Vancouver-Quadra):

That all the words after "That" to the end of the question be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"this house is of the opinion that the welfare of the Canadian people requires the adoption now of a national development policy which will develop our natural resources for the maximum benefit of all parts of Canada, encourage more processing of those resources in Canada, correct the present

serious unfavourable trade balances, foster wider financial participation by Canadians in the development of our resources, and promote greater opportunity and employment for a steadily increasing population."

Mr. Speaker: May I be allowed to say a word at this moment because of the broad description of "various matters" included in the amendment that has been moved as a grievance? I have made the point before, and I would like to tell the house that in my humble opinion this is not the type of grievance provided for under our rules upon a motion to go into supply.

The citation to which I would like hon. members to refer is citation 345—Beauchesne, Third Edition—to start with, especially the latter part which says:

Members may discuss various matters on the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair without any amendment being proposed; but once debate is stopped on one matter and another matter intervenes, members cannot again discuss the former.

The question is: What is "a matter" with respect to this? Let us turn to citation 468, which says:

It sometimes happens, on the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for committee of supply, that members air grievances without moving amendments. A member may speak on railway rates—

That is a matter.

—another on naturalization—

That is another matter.

—and so on. Five or six different matters may then be brought to the government's attention. But no member is allowed to speak more than once on the motion. He cannot discuss all the matters which may then come up, and when he has spoken on one of them he has exhausted his right to speak to the motion before the house, namely, "that the Speaker do now leave the chair".

If no amendment had been moved at the end of the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), what matter would hon. members consider would have been before the house? Is it the Bermuda conference? Is it the Quebec conference suggested by the Leader of the Opposition? Is it the suggested policy about the development of natural resources? Is it the Gordon commission report? Is it American investment in Canada, or foreign investment in Canada and its implications? Would it be federal-provincial co-operation in the matter of economics? Would it be grants in aid of the development of our northern resources? Would it be power development policies? Would it be the equalization of economic opportunities across Canada, such as the South Saskatchewan river dam which, hon. members will recall, was the subject of a grievance at one point—I think it was a year or two ago? Would it be changes in taxation?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]