

Income Tax Act

and there seems to be a lack of equity in the dominion government's favouring one of them at the expense of the others.

Now listen to this:

Brantford has a Liberal as its member of parliament while the other centres mentioned are represented by Conservatives.

That is the part I want the government to listen to, because I shall have something more to say about it at a later date. The article ends: "Looks like the Grey Prison Farm decision."

Mr. Caouette: I am grateful for the courtesy the official opposition have extended to us in not sending us a copy of the amendment. We cannot study it. We do not know exactly what they mean and we would appreciate having a copy so that we could see exactly what it contains.

[Translation]

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, the statement of the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler) is correct and applies just as well to the province of Quebec.

In my opinion, this clause is discriminatory to our country since it establishes a distinction between certain areas. The minister should move an amendment to change the clause.

Besides, this section infringes upon provincial autonomy. It is just like putting shackles on certain municipalities. The government should propose an amendment to change the entire clause in order to treat all areas of the country equitably and to stop such discrimination.

I believe the government should mend its ways. Moreover, I am not the only one to make observations along this line, since members on this side of the house generally agree with me on the attitude of the government regarding this particular clause. It has not been adequately thought out, it is contrary to the spirit of provincial autonomy, contrary to common sense, since it is discriminatory.

[Text]

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, I merely want to raise a point of order or a point of privilege. I am not sure which. We are being asked to vote on an amendment we have not seen. I have not got a clue as to what it is. I wonder whether it would be possible for us to be given a copy of the amendment.

The Chairman: The Chair will read the amendment again for the benefit of the hon. member who does not have a copy. Mr. Alkenbrack moved:

That section 71A (1) (b) be amended by adding: "except that the provisions of this section shall

apply only where the municipality in which such taxpayer carries on business has requested the benefit thereof, and that municipalities receiving such benefits must not be closer to each other than 100 miles."

Mr. Langlois: We have been told that there is a little bit of discrimination on the part of the government but certainly the setting of this arbitrary distance of 100 miles is also a form of discrimination. In some areas industrial centres are more than 100 miles apart but in other regions they are closer than that. Actually the amendment is imposing a restriction of 100 miles, which is also a form of discrimination. What is the logic in setting the distance at 100 miles? If it is necessary to make it 50 miles for some municipalities we should make it 50 miles. Why set a distance of 100 miles between each municipality that may ask for this assistance? In my view this is also a form of discrimination.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members the speech made the other day by the hon. member for Oxford which has to do directly with this question of the distance of 100 miles. He said that rather than using a more or less bureaucratic statistical method to establish designated areas it would be much better to look at the matter from the point of view of a metropolitan area. He pointed out that Toronto is a large area extending for some 24 to 30 miles, I believe he said. There is no question that this legislation might well apply to certain portions of Toronto. He compared the situation there with the city of Brantford which has been named as a designated area. The city of Brantford is one of a number of cities in an area of roughly 24 miles. Why pick it out on a statistical basis? Why should all the other towns in the immediate area of Brantford not be named also?

I think his point was very well taken that under the present method the economic set-up is interfered with. As he suggested, within this area of 24 miles there is no question that the chambers of commerce and the town councils have gone out for business. Their efforts in this regard are upset by this form of discrimination when you simply say to them: We will name you on a statistical basis in a bureaucratic manner; we will not even consult you; we will simply name you. This method discriminates against all the other cities which are within a very few miles of the designated city. They are an economic unit and there is no question that they should be treated as a whole.

Offhand I would say that certain areas within Toronto might well want to apply. There are areas which for one reason or