

Government Orders

1, 1992, be read the second time and referred to Legislative Committee E.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member for South Shore has three minutes remaining.

Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have a bit of time to complete my remarks.

I was commenting on the many measures in the budget government has provided that are going to create the kind of climate for a business to flourish that results in job creation. I know that is a subject of concern to all members of this House.

The reduction in the manufacturing and processing tax is one example. Another example is the increase in the capital cost allowance, critically important to business, though I noticed my friends in the New Democratic Party consider it a loophole, which is rather bizarre. The reduction in the reciprocal withholding tax, increased incentives for R and D, and changes in capital gains exemption that will encourage investment in manufacturing are other examples. It is important to note, with respect to people who have properties now they were thinking of selling, that comes into effect on the date of the budget and not before. Further examples are enhanced support for small business and encouragement for the growth adventure capital funds.

All these are examples of items in the budget that are going to result not only in the flourishing of business but in the increasing of jobs. I believe the minister anticipates an impact of 500,000 jobs.

This is the kind of performance that the minister has delivered. He showed that he listened to Canadians. He has further listened to them by reducing wastage in government and unnecessary spending, the rationalization of some 46 agencies or indeed the abolition of those that are no longer required. We hear gnashing of teeth because a particular agency is going to be dissolved, but perhaps when that agency was established there were not all the private sector agencies performing the same functions. Why unnecessarily spend the taxpayer's money?

There are some significant, symbolic changes that will save a few dollars but, more important, will send a message to the people of Canada such as getting rid of first class air travel. I do not know why we ever had first class air travel at the expense of the taxpayer. The

ministers themselves have bitten the bullet and taken a reduction in their own incomes, and I commend them for doing that.

I am delighted to see the continued improvement in benefits for disabled Canadians. It must be a goal of all members of this House, I am sure, to see measures brought in that are going to encourage the economic integration of these people into Canadian society and to ensure that each has the right to earn a living, to live with dignity and to make their contribution to Canadian life.

It all adds up to a good future for this country. I am sure all members of this House will want to join with me in commending the Minister of Finance for the outstanding job he has done in bringing forth this budget.

Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great attention to the previous speaker and I have two questions. If it is such a good idea and such an enormously successful budget, why are they at 11 per cent?

The second question I am sure I will be asking him next week is why they are at 6 per cent.

An hon. member: We do not want to peak too soon.

Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River): He does not want to peak too soon. I knew there was a good reason.

I wanted to ask the member about something more important. It involves the cutbacks in the budget to legal defence funds and advocacy agencies. In the community of Powell River there are 22 women who have been driven out of their jobs by the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. It has refused to bargain with them in good faith and they are now out of their jobs, over Christmas and continuing on, and strike-breakers have been hired by the bank to go in and replace these unionized workers.

Today we asked the Minister responsible for the Status of Women if she would meet with these women to discuss the kinds of problems they have. The Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and the other chartered banks in Canada have a disastrous record with labour relations and the exploitation of women. The federal government has to get onboard. There has to be activity within the Department of Labour to inquire into the kinds of activities that are going on there. The Minister responsible for the Status of Women made an absolutely obscene comment today, that she does not think it is her role to get involved. In virtually every single case it is