

Income Tax

years. These companies do not employ many people. They are capital-intensive, not labour-intensive. They do not supply tens of thousands of jobs. Therefore, the policies followed by the Minister of Finance are very bad indeed. In some ways they have become repulsive, looking at some of the public statements that have been made on programs to the effect that they will help people.

I spoke to someone who had called a radio show on Remembrance Day to speak to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald). The caller asked why disability pensions had not been increased. Over the past five-years, veterans' disability pensions have fallen off by approximately \$6 million a year, for a total of \$30 million. The minister replied that pensions had not been increased because the government had to tighten its belt. He said the government was not a money machine and could not go on increasing spending forever.

Mr. Lalonde: You are misleading the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Tell that to the veterans.

Mr. Nystrom: In the same budget, the government saw fit to give the corporations of this country some \$1.2 billion.

Mr. Lumley: To create jobs.

Mr. Nystrom: Like Inco creating jobs with all the gifts they have received from this government! They are laying off some 4,000 employees. I spent a great deal of time putting the statistics on the record. What about Alcan and the other companies that have been given gifts and are laying off people? If the government is going to subsidize a private corporation to create jobs, and the corporation does not create jobs, it should refund the money to the government with interest, so that it can be used elsewhere to create jobs for the ordinary people of Canada. However, that is not being done by this government.

Look at the unemployment situation. The President of the Treasury Board said that our economy is really good but there are too many gloom and doom people in the opposition and in the press gallery who are not telling Canadians the truth. I referred to unemployment in other parts of the world. Canada is the worst of all countries, despite our vast resources. A lot must be done to clear up this situation. I referred briefly to some of the statistics which are a disgrace. We now have a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in Canada of 8.3 per cent. Our average over the past 15 years has been 5.4 per cent. It has become a lot worse in the past few years.

We have a very high rate of unemployment: 13.5 per cent in the Atlantic provinces, 11.4 per cent in Quebec, 8.5 per cent in British Columbia, 6.8 per cent in Ontario, and 4.8 per cent on the prairies. What is the government going to do about that? What is it going to do to get these people back to work, rather than give them hand-outs? Is the government just going to go on in the same old conservative fashion of stimulating the large corporations which only operate at 80 per cent capacity? If they wished, they could easily expand that rate of production.

[Mr. Nystrom.]

I suggest the government should be doing almost the opposite of what it is doing. Instead of stimulating the top, they should be stimulating the bottom, giving a major tax break to low and middle income people. If you increase their purchasing power it will stimulate demand. Perhaps some of the unused capacity of the corporations could then be utilized. More jobs would be created as a result of the increased purchasing power. These people could then buy the necessities of life for themselves and their families. This is what must be done if we want to get people back to work and have an economy that is strong and buoyant.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motions, public bills. Before calling the order for today I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members that last week the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) raised a point of order as to the procedure in bringing a motion before the House and standing other motions. The hon. member questioned the procedure that has been followed in the past.

Upon an interpretation of the Chair of Standing Orders 19(1) and 49(1) and their application, the Chair left the way open for the hon. member to request reconsideration of the decision at a later date. In his remarks at that time the hon. member requested that the Chair re-examine the whole question of programming of private members' hour as far as notices of motions are concerned. Further to that, the hon. member for Vaudreuil wrote a letter to Mr. Speaker of which I have just received a copy. That letter raised points that go beyond the question of standing motions under Standing Orders 19(1) and 49(1). It goes as far as questioning the right of the government to plan the work of private members' hour.

In light of this point in particular, as well as the other point, I think I should take this whole question under advisement. I would invite comment from hon. members the next time notices of motions are taken during private members' hour. At that time I hope the Chair can render a decision on this whole question.

● (1702)

Mr. Paproski: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a disposition to allow the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to proceed with motion No. 14 and to allow the preceding motions to stand at the request of the government.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 19(1), I ask, on behalf of the government, that all motions