

*Income Tax Act*

respect, because that is the fact. This bill will hurt the cattle industry in Canada, a cattle industry that will be and has been subject to severe competition on the North American market.

I do not have to recite to the House the effect of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in 1951 because it is well known. As a result of that outbreak we were cut off from the North American cattle market and right away cattle prices dropped ten cents a pound. We have just recovered from that low of the early 1950's. Although the outbreak of foot and mouth disease did not hurt the cattle industry as such in Canada, it did cut us off from the North American cattle market and caused a drop in price. That is why I ask whether we should adopt a piece of legislation that almost does as much harm and certainly hampers and hinders the cattle industry of Canada.

It has been suggested that I want to hold up this bill. I do not want to hold it up for the sake of holding it up, but I am on sound and firm ground when I contend that in this bill we are being coldhearted to the best part of Canada's agricultural industry. We are being insensitive. I do not think any adjective would be too strong to describe the attitude displayed by the parliamentary secretary and the minister in this debate and their reluctance to put forward facts. When goaded to they then have to correct themselves later and accept the facts I put forward.

People ask me why it is Liberal policies have been so firmly rejected in western Canada. These policies have not been bad in all cases; the reason is the callous attitude adopted by the government. For example, the Prime Minister says in Winnipeg, "why should I sell your wheat", showing an indifference that people out west have not recovered from yet. The attitude that the government is displaying toward the livestock industry in removing the basic herd contributes to the indifference.

Westerners are generous, bighearted and will soon forgive a man and give him a second chance. But that man has to show interest and concern for the west. He has to demonstrate that he is learning and is sympathetic to western problems. This government has not shown that it is. Operation Lift was an example. The government said to the farmers: "Here it is; buy it. If you don't like it you can lump it, because we are going to eliminate the surplus of wheat." The farmers did not like it and they had to lump it.

Then the government introduced its grain stabilization bill and there was much heated argument over it. The prairie agricultural ministers came to Ottawa to discuss it and asked the government to reconsider it because it was unacceptable. But the government said: "No, we are not going to make any changes to the bill". Here once again I am on solid, concrete ground. The government has not even studied the application of the capital gains tax to the U.S. cattle industry, yet they are prepared to implement such a tax as far as the Canadian cattle industry is concerned. Once more this shows lack of concern and indifference.

I am thankful, Mr. Chairman, that this lack of concern and indifference has fully registered on the people of western Canada. If the hon. member opposite gets to his feet and says that the hon. member for Crowfoot is just a loud mouth and does not know what he is talking about,

[Mr. Horner.]

that he is just blowing off steam and if we hear him out it will be all right, then that is one thing. But when he stands up and says that I should keep my mouth shut so my ears can hear and then 15 minutes later has to correct himself and say that I was right and he was wrong, then whose ears should be opened, would you say, Mr. Chairman? I think that illustrates who it is that should be listened to.

I led into this subject as gently and as quietly as I could with all the finesse that I could muster last night. I started to ask a few questions. I asked whether the government had considered the United States situation and the parliamentary secretary was kind enough to say: "Well, we will not make a decision yet; we will take a look at it". Again today I suggested that if the government does not like having to listen to my repeating myself and haranguing the government about its callous indifference, let the hon. member opposite stand clause 29 so it can be reconsidered. They can indicate that they are not going to buy my suggestion, or adopt the United States system, but let them say they will take a look at my suggestions and also examine the application of the capital gains tax. Then at least the government will indicate that its ears are open and that some of the comments made on this side of the House are penetrating. But apparently the government is not even prepared to do that.

As I look across the House I observe that the great defenders of government farm policy are nowhere to be seen. The great advocates on the Prairies, these great defenders of agricultural policy, these livestock and grain men, are just not around. They are all represented by one man who looks as though he might be prepared to speak on this subject, and I hope he does. I think he is indicating that he will, so at least I have been penetrating his ears, something that I can assure the committee is appreciated in all corners of the House.

This issue is an indication of why government policies are not accepted in western Canada. The minister in charge of the Wheat Board gives us the answer: "Well, I guess we didn't sell our story well enough". What did the Prime Minister say in Calgary this summer about Bill C-176? He said that the people out there had been listening to false prophets. He also said: "You Liberals in western Canada have not sold the story well enough". No matter what the story is, Mr. Chairman, it has to be sold if it is to be accepted. You have to convince people that the government is interested in them, that the government is trying to help them. Once they are convinced of that you can then explain how you are going to help them. However, if a man is convinced beforehand that you are not trying to help him he will not listen to you. He will not take your medicine or benefit from the salve that you rub on his wounds.

• (12:20 p.m.)

I have pointed out vividly that the United States cattleman is in a better position in respect of capital gains than is a Canadian. I have pointed out why we should be in a better position. Cattlemen in the United States have proximity to large markets. They have a favourable climate. The livestock industry in Canada suffers from pretty severe winters. Let the hon. member for Meadow Lake tell us about ranching in northern Saskatchewan. Let the hon. member for Dauphin tell us about the situation of ranch-