

furthermore, tend to unfairly affect that important industrial area of Richmond, which is on Sea Island, by making an uncalled for addition to the cost of production.

To my mind, however, the greatest argument against the proposed toll system is that it will force all employees on Sea Island to pay to go to their places of employment, even if they live within the municipality. This seems to me to be unjust. It is an even greater injustice when you consider that of the estimated 10,000 persons employed on Sea Island very few will be using the Hudson Street crossing. It does not make sense for them to use it because most live east and south of the new facility. Yet they will still be required to pay tolls even if they continue to use the Moray Channel and Dinsmore Island bridges which are presently toll-free. So we are faced with a situation in which a charge would be made for which no appreciable benefit would be received. Surely, we cannot be expected to tolerate such a situation.

The people of Burnaby-Richmond-Delta are reasonable people. They have reasonable expectations. Therefore, when they see that between \$400 million and \$500 million is being spent by the federal government on the first phase alone of an airport to service Montreal, they quite rightly begin to question why they should be asked to pay, through tolls, the \$21.2 million cost of a new approach to Vancouver International Airport.

Even if we were to couple this \$21.2 million figure with the cost of the new terminal which was opened at Vancouver International in 1968, we would see that Montreal would still be receiving roughly nine times more in federal aid than Vancouver. This is so even though Montreal handles only twice as many passengers as Vancouver. What is more, these figures I am quoting do not even include the \$20 million in contributions allocated for the 1971-72 fiscal year by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. That department announced last March that a new special designated area has been set up which corresponds with the area surrounding the new Montreal International Airport. Why are the funds being given? According to the departmental press releases they are meant in part "to integrate the airport in its regional setting". Hon. members will agree that \$20 million represents quite a healthy integration. Is the Quebec case an isolated example based on special considerations? It would appear that the answer is no. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) indicated in the House on May 11, 1971, that he is prepared to discuss any similar proposals put forward by the Ontario Transport Minister in respect of the new Toronto airport.

What am I suggesting to the government, Mr. Speaker? My proposal is straightforward. I propose that the federal government rescind the announced tolls and let the electorate of the province of British Columbia deal with the Bennett government in its own way. Admittedly we on the lower mainland in general, and Burnaby-Richmond-Delta in particular, are being made to pay for the B.C. government régime's lack of foresight and failure to accept responsibility. We are being asked to pay a toll because the government of British Columbia is not responsive to the needs of the people. I submit to the

The Budget—Mr. Nowlan

House that if the people of British Columbia were to be penalized in dollar terms every time the Bennett government was shortsighted, there would not be enough money in the whole of Canada to cover the penalties.

This toll will divide the municipality of Richmond. It will increase costs to industries on Sea Island. It will inflict an added financial burden on many employees without providing any benefit. It will add to the cost of construction and it will make Vancouver International Airport the only federally-tolled airport in Canada. It will make the Hudson Street crossing the only toll bridge in British Columbia. The tolls must come off, and I urge the federal government to show that it is sensitive enough to respond to the will of the people on this issue, even though the provincial government is not.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I want to contribute a few remarks to this budget debate. I will refrain from commenting on many of the remarks I have heard here today as I sat trying to catch Your Honour's eye. Basically, the credibility of this budget has been questioned with just cause as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) played his shell game of sham. But after the benign cloud of Benson bounty dissolves, the taxpayer will still be stuck for the tab. Not just the rich or near rich, but all taxpayers with taxable income between \$500 and \$10,000 will pay more once the dust settles and the time for tax collector comes around again.

Much could be said about the impact of some of the specific budget proposals in my riding, and frankly almost as much about the continued absence of proposals favouring individual initiative and individual incentive. The capital gains tax in this budget dilutes progressive tax rates, and once you get on the tax ladder the one diminishes the other. Certainly, the farmer will find little to please him if accountants and computers becomes almost as important in his life as crops and the weather. Such topics as the plight of the small businessman, help to the helpless property owners, financial assistance to universities and the international export crap game with our floating exchange rate and no compensatory tax relief for consequent losses could quickly exhaust my time. There are a multitude of other topics which I should like to discuss.

Perhaps the kindest thing which can be said about this budget is that if death and taxes are inevitable, then thank goodness Benson is not. After a Conservative government commenced tax reform with the appointment of the Carter Commission, this country I suggest would have been better served, and our economy would be in a better state of health today, if the minister had not been so belligerent and bullheaded when he first produced his white paper. A receptive and open mind then with a reasonable response—not a complete but a reasonable response—to constructive criticism might have avoided or at least have reduced the resultant business uncertainty and subsequent economic stagnation as businessmen marked time while the Minister of Finance tried to make up his mind. While this was going on, the country fell behind. I do not think some of the palliatives in this