

much more cheaply over a period of time, thereby saving taxpayers' money.

If we are discussing energy and saving taxpayers' money let us talk about the Pacific environment centre which the government, a little over a year and a half ago, was determined to set up in north Vancouver. It was the only place it could go. The employees protested that they did not want it there. They did not want to have anything to do with it. The government said that it must go there, and that it was a necessity. The minister happened to be defeated in that riding, and we no longer have the same necessity for the environment centre on the north shore.

These are areas that the minister should be looking at, rather than at the boat owner, if he wants to save taxpayers' money. We are not talking about the rich here. We are talking about many average Canadians, like the guy who wants to go fishing after a hard day's work. I must blame the minister because he is responsible. We always talk about the bureaucrats,—we have one sitting here now and I do not like to criticize anyone—but certainly these bureaucrats living in Ottawa do not understand that the people of Canada like to get out in their boats. They do not like to be increasingly taxed on their boats. It is becoming too expensive, and our Minister of Finance could advise some of his other ministers to save some money for the people of Canada instead of taxing one small segment of the population.

Another thing I would like to discuss briefly before I sit down is the effect that this bill will have on boat manufacturers. In my riding, and especially in the areas of Richmond and Delta, many boats are manufactured which come under this bill. It will have a great effect on these manufacturers. They have already told me that their sales are down for this month. The month is not over yet, and they do not expect them to improve. As the minister knows, people can go to Hong Kong, buy a boat, stay outside the country for a year, and save about two-thirds of the cost. That has had an effect on our large boatbuilding industry. This goes a little further and affects people with smaller boats. The minister must understand these problems.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): First he was talking about his constituents; now he is talking about his friends.

Mr. Reynolds: I just want to inform the minister that the boatbuilders in my riding are my constituents and they also voted for me, but I do not have one personal friend in the boat manufacturing business. I could not give you the name of one of them, but I think this is a problem affecting both boatbuilders and consumers. This bill affects people using boats and also people who manufacture them. The minister knows that British Columbia has one of the highest unemployment statistics in Canada. It also has the highest inflation in Canada. We need people working and ought not to be putting them out of business, something which this bill is going to do.

Excise

Mrs. Campagnolo: Blame that on David Barrett.

● (1520)

Mr. Reynolds: I think the minister and I agree that the Premier of British Columbia is not helping our province at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reynolds: But I think the premier and I agree that the minister is not helping our province either.

I would close by predicting to this minister, who can sit there and smile, that he is going to have to withdraw those two items. Members from his side who have spoken against them cannot now get up in the House and vote for them. If members on that side who have spoken against this vote against it, the bill will go down in defeat. I think it is a good bill and I think that in order to save it the minister should withdraw those two items. Then maybe we could finish the bill off more quickly.

Mr. Symes: Madam Chairman, I raised some points with the minister in committee yesterday which I hope he will answer today. I find it very interesting to note that every speaker in committee yesterday and today objected to the 10 per cent tax on boats, boat motors over 20 horsepower, and on small aircraft. I am surprised that the hon. member for Algoma and the hon. member for Cochrane, those northern Ontario districts, do not realize what a detrimental effect this tax will have on marine operators, boat operators and tourist operators and that they have not raised an objection.

I have an amendment which I should like to move if the minister does not withdraw item 11 on page 11. I will read it into the record in order to give the minister advance notice of it:

That Bill C-40 be amended by deleting the word "twenty" in clause 21, subclause 2(11), page 11, line 29 and line 30, and substituting therefor the word "eighty-five" in lines 29 and 30.

This would have the effect of only permitting the 10 per cent excise tax to be applied on boats propelled by motors over 85 horsepower. As marine distributors have pointed out in representations to me, and as I tried to show in the House yesterday, the bulk of their sales are in the 20 to 85 horsepower range. The tax would put many of them out of business, or severely reduce their sales if it were applied to motors in that range. If we are to look at this as a luxury tax, then it should be applied to motors over 85 horsepower. My amendment would put that section in the context that we could apply the 10 per cent tax to boats propelled by motors of 85 horsepower and over, and actual outboard motors of 85 horsepower and over.

I hope the minister will consider seriously the argument advanced by members who object to item 11 on page 11 because this tax will not achieve what he hoped for, the conservation of energy. Instead, it will increase unemployment and discriminate against areas such as northern Ontario that depend on the tourist industry. It will also discriminate against people such as those mentioned by my colleague from the Northwest Territories, and people who depend on boats and small aircraft to get around.

While I am on my feet I should like to say how much I support the arguments of the hon. member for Vegreville,