

The Budget—Hon. John N. Turner

withering of good will in society, the growing of despair and a recession of the spirit as it has been called. This recession of the spirit can come to Canada. There is no inherent reason why it should, but it could very well come here. I urge the government to not only think about crises but about opportunities that exist in the hearts and minds of people and their desire to serve society. Opportunities for the aged will go a long way toward achieving this goal.

• (1800)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): The hour set aside for private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 o'clock, when the Minister of Finance will submit a ways and means motion to the House.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

[English]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance) moved:

That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, my first words to this House as Minister of Finance last February were that my most urgent priority was jobs. This remains my first priority. No economy is working as well as it should if there are men and women in this country seeking work who cannot find it. The search for jobs is a human problem. The main thrust of this budget is to deal with this problem; to buttress the Canadian economy—to provide incentives for Canadian industry to grow and compete and provide jobs.

The only realistic solution for matching the tremendous yearly increase in our work force, which will continue at the present rate for the next several years, is greater growth in the economy. It is growth that will create jobs. I mean growth in the private sector. I mean real jobs, not temporary jobs. I mean jobs that last and satisfy. I believe that we have to look to expansion of Canadian industry and the commitment of business to provide those jobs.

What makes it important to take stock of our position now is the fact that the world is caught up in the midst of far-reaching changes, the outcome of which is not easy to predict. The already rapid rate of advances in technology continues to accelerate, bringing about vast changes in our lives, in our way of producing goods, and in our way of doing business. Multinational corporate giants have to come to assume an increasingly dominant role on the

[Mr. Kaplan.]

world economic state and in the Canadian economy. I fear that the world is in the process of being transformed into massive trading blocs, which in itself is of immense significance to Canada as a major trading nation. Moreover, the relative competitive position of the various nations is also undergoing a pronounced change. This was the hard fact that lay behind the international monetary crisis which came to a head last summer when the United States adopted a series of measures to halt the deterioration in its own competitive position.

Because all of these developments have far-reaching implications for the future of our own country, it is only sensible and realistic for us to take a new look at our situation and to consider what policies will best serve our long-term interests.

What I shall strive to do tonight is to set the stage for Canadian industry to be competitive in world markets. Our ability to gain access to world markets is a prerequisite to the success of any industrial policy that focuses on growth and jobs.

I am hoping to achieve industrial growth at a pace that will not aggravate the inflationary impulses in the economy and escalate the cost of living. This government is committed to reasonable price stability. I am committed tonight to propose ways to render justice to those people in our community who have been hurt by the rise in the cost of living and who have no way of fighting back. I am speaking of those Canadians who have retired, whose working days are over, and of our veterans and their dependants.

• (2010)

I said once before to this House that a Minister of Finance is not an economic czar. It is true that through its fiscal policies the federal government can and must play a central role in guiding the course of the economy. It is important to understand, however, that there are some very real constraints on the ability of the federal government alone to ensure that the economy remains precisely on course at all times.

The policies and programs of the provinces and municipalities have a major impact on the economy, their combined revenues and expenditures now significantly exceeding those of the federal government. Then, too, in our free enterprise system the way in which our economy moves is determined in a fundamental way by the day-to-day decisions taken in the market-place by millions of Canadians. Of course, our economy is also strongly influenced by forces from abroad. The difficulty of anticipating and responding to the impact on the economy of all these forces is further compounded by the universal limitation of economic information. For all these reasons, it makes good sense for the government to stand ready to make periodic adjustments in its fiscal policies as the need for them becomes evident.

[Translation]

But there are also occasions when budgets must have a broader perspective and look further into the future. There are times when they must deal with more fundamental and longer-term problems related to the structure of the economy itself. In my budget tonight, Mr. Speaker, I shall propose an important revision in our fiscal system

to strengthen the capacity of our economy to serve the needs of the Canadian people in the years ahead.

Budgets, however, need to be concerned not only with the economy as a whole. They must also be directed to improve the well-being of individual Canadians, especially those who find themselves in less fortunate circumstances. Over the years, we have made great progress in Canada in developing a social system to provide equitable and just treatment for all our citizens. We must make still more progress in the years ahead.

[English]

I turn now to a review of the economy. I propose to be brief since a comprehensive economic review has already been tabled for the information of members. There is a great deal of information in this document and I trust the members of the House will find it a useful reference document. This evening I propose to touch only on some highlights of our recent experience.

The Economy

The Canadian economy provided a substantially bigger increase in the goods, services and jobs available to Canadians in 1971 than it did in 1970. This improved performance owed a great deal to the expansionary policies of the government.

Personal incomes grew more rapidly in 1971 because of higher employment, higher wage rates and higher farm incomes. The cuts in personal taxes during the past year meant that the net incomes at the disposal of Canadians after allowance for taxes rose even more rapidly than their gross incomes. An increase in payments by government under various social assistance, cultural and educational programs contributed to this growth. The improvement in the financial position of our people permitted them to borrow more and to spend more. This they did. But while consuming considerably more, at the same time they increased their savings and reduced their debt relative to their incomes. Thus, in spite of greatly increased consumption, their financial position was significantly stronger at the end of the year than at the beginning. This means that consumers are likely to spend even more this year.

Housing starts in 1971 broke all records. CMHC concentrated on housing for low-income groups. Private financing of housing increased dramatically and provided a vigorous forward thrust in this sector of the economy.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, exports grew again in 1971 in spite of declining rates of growth in our major European and Asian markets and in spite of menacing developments in the international commercial environment during the second half of the year. The extraordinary growth of 1970 was not duplicated. That could hardly be expected, but the growth in exports of many commodities such as iron and steel, automobiles, oil and gas, lumber and wheat was particularly noteworthy.

Imports responded to the rising pace of activity in the Canadian economy and grew at a very fast clip. This speeding up was shown by a wide range of goods, including fuels and lubricants, industrial materials, and materials for home consumption. Imports of machinery and

The Budget—Hon. John N. Turner

equipment remained sluggish in the first half of the year, but spurred ahead in the latter half.

This fast rise in imports resulted in the decline in our surplus on merchandise trade in 1971. At the same time, our traditional deficit in services continued its steady increase. Taking goods and services together we had a current account surplus in 1971 for the second year running but distinctly smaller than in 1970. With the United States there was a moderate increase in our current account deficit, which in 1971 amounted to over a third of a billion dollars.

Last year we saw a rise in productivity, but we also saw a considerable acceleration in the growth of employment. We saw, too, as the year progressed some considerable pick-up of inventory investment. The ratio of inventories to sales still remains low by previous standards, even allowing for the fact that new technology permits some economizing in inventories. The rise of demand had not yet progressed to the point, however, of inducing a major expansion of business fixed investment.

Although the number of new jobs created in 1971 was twice the number created in 1970, it was only in the latter part of the year that job creation outpaced the very rapid growth in the labour force. Since September the unemployment rate has been on a downward trend. It is still unacceptably high, and the first priority of this government is to bring about a further substantial reduction in unemployment.

[English]

Prices and incomes showed mixed trends last year. Labour income per employed person, for the second year in a row, grew at a lower rate than in the previous year. This rate was, however, still greater than the rate of increase of productivity and the cost of living combined. Profits increased from their depressed levels of the previous year. The consumer price index was dominated by the strong increase in food prices, which were held down in the earlier part of the year by a price war among food chains, but rose at rapid rates after that. Even apart from food prices, however, there was unmistakable evidence as the year drew to a close of a quickening pace of price advances.

The over-all fiscal policy of the government has continued to be expansionary. In this it has been supported by the monetary policy. This policy last year created credit conditions conducive to economic expansion and relief of upward pressures on the value of the Canadian dollar. There was a large expansion of the money supply. Interest rates, which varied somewhat over the course of the year, were on the average distinctly lower than during the previous year and lower at the end of the year than at the beginning. This year the fast expansion of the monetary aggregates has continued. Recently there has been some increase in interest rates both in Canada and the United States. On balance, the value of the Canadian dollar continues to be strong.

• (2020)

Summing up, the Canadian economy is expanding firmly and steadily. This in spite of the fact that as last year began, there was widespread uncertainty as to the future. This uncertainty was reinforced by the interna-

The Budget—Hon. John N. Turner

tional economic crisis which beset us last August. The Smithsonian agreement of last December did much to dispel that uncertainty. Other factors contributed, particularly the expansionist measures introduced by my predecessor, now the Minister of National Defence. The mood of the country is one of growing confidence. I believe this confidence is well founded. I do not express this belief in any idle way, unmindful of some very real problems. We must continue to press for lower levels of unemployment. Price increases must be kept in check. But there is no question that the economy is advancing and gaining strength. Confidence is contagious and I believe it is spreading.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, the government this year will expand its program of summer employment for young people. We are dealing here with a challenging problem. In recent years, there has been a great upsurge in the number of students who pour out of school in the late spring to seek interesting and well-paying jobs. This year there are about 1,400,000 students of 16 years and over who will become potential job-seekers or look to the community for interesting and meaningful summer activity. This is almost three times the number only ten years ago. Most of these young people will be absorbed in productive jobs in the expanding private sector of the economy. For a second year, however, a diverse range of programs in the federal opportunities for youth plan, aided by a number of similar provincial programs, will help to fill gaps in the supply of jobs this summer.

I should draw attention, also, to the significant improvements which the government has now proposed to the manpower training program. These amendments will extend its flexibility and efficiency. In that connection, the experimental program of on-the-job training introduced last fall was enthusiastically received, and the government has provided a total of \$50 million for this purpose. I fully anticipate that on-the-job training will become a permanent and increasingly effective part of our overall manpower training policy.

[English]

Let me turn now to a brief review of some important, current developments in federal-provincial fiscal relations. The most significant of these, of course, has been the recent enactment by parliament of the new Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act. The passage of Bill C-8 brought to fruition a long and intensive period of consultations with the provinces.

We have now extended in time and content the framework within which the federal and provincial governments jointly share the personal income tax field on a co-operative basis. Taken together with previous announcements by Quebec and other provinces, the recent budget announcement by the Ontario government that it will bring into conformity its corporation income tax on essential fundamentals with the reformed federal act, also assures continued tax co-ordination across Canada.

Most important of all, however, we have renewed the equalization arrangements which are so vital to national unity in Canada. In recent weeks, I have been speaking on

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

this critical issue on several occasions, stressing that national unity is not just a question of language, important as that undoubtedly is.

National unity has a great deal to do with equality of opportunity—equality of opportunity for Canadians, no matter where they happen to be born or where they happen to live in our country. Equality of opportunity, in turn, means equalizing the ability of all the provinces to provide a national standard of services to Canadians. Our style of unity contemplates diversity and not uniformity. We are together as a united community of people in a unified, but not unitary, state. This is not to say that we want to pursue an inward-looking or narrow nationalism. Rather, as Canadians, we want to maintain and strengthen our sense of unity, our identity and our independence. With that goes the need to achieve a desirable regional balance across this beautiful land, to deepen the sense of belonging to a community and a nation, and to enhance the opportunities for meaningful participation in the collective decisions which affect our daily lives.

Equality of opportunity means a common standard of services to Canadians everywhere. National unity means sharing money and resources and this is the burden of our fiscal arrangements legislation. This is why the fiscal relations between Ottawa and the provinces are the cornerstone of confederation. It doesn't do anything for our country to try to do fine calculations of gains and losses, of who pays more and who receives more, because national unity cannot be calculated on a balance sheet.

Although equalization transfers are paid to provincial governments, it is obvious that their benefit is directed primarily toward the lower-income people in the receiving provinces. Without this sharing of national wealth, millions of Canadians would be deprived of the health, education, welfare and development services which are as much a part of income in a civilized society as the cash to buy three square meals a day. Equalization, taken together with shared-cost programs, provides much of the underpinning for social equity across the country.

Look at what parliament has done in the past few years to improve the lives of Canadians: medicare; increased supplementary pensions for the aged; the elimination of one million lower-income Canadians from the income tax rolls; the proposed fundamental reform and major increases in family allowances; the huge increase in federal contributions for education and student loans; a doubling of financial assistance for our native people; the broadening of unemployment insurance.

I should like now to speak briefly of certain features of our economic situation from a wider perspective.

Canada has a very fast-growing labour force, both because of the age structure of our population and because more and more women want to work outside the home. The population and the work force are concentrating in urban areas. That is where most people want to be, that is where they want to work and that is where jobs must be provided for them.

In an urban society people provide fewer and fewer services for themselves and they therefore demand more services in the market. Over the past quarter-century and more our service industries have grown substantially. By

their very nature, most of our service industries are sheltered from foreign competition and are continuing to do very well.

Canada's resource industries are very strong and the outlook for them is bright. We have been blessed with a rich abundance of most natural resources to meet not only our own needs, but the growing demands from the rest of the world. They continue to be accorded favourable treatment under our reformed income tax system.

In agriculture, a very rapid rise in productivity with a corresponding decline in the need for farm workers, has necessitated a continuing process of adjustment. Here a wide range of federal programs have been put in place, including price supports, organized marketing, long and short-term credit, favourable tax treatment, and production development aid. New measures only recently introduced have improved all of these programs. Last year, farm net income rose by almost 25 per cent over 1970. The dairy industry is currently benefiting from a substantial firming in world price levels, and this year exports of grain and cereals from Western Canada will surpass all previous records. Much the same can be said of the fishing industry, where a number of important new programs have been implemented to improve productivity and stability and to raise the incomes of fishermen.

Our manufacturing industries are the largest single source of employment in Canada, providing jobs for more than one-fifth of all working Canadians. But by contrast with other sectors of the economy, this important sector is the one that is most exposed and most vulnerable to the challenge of change and international competition.

During the postwar period, the output of our manufacturing industries has not kept pace with the growth of the economy as a whole. Employment in the manufacturing industries has declined moderately as a proportion of total employment in Canada during this period.

In our trade in manufactured goods, we run a very large deficit, importing substantially more than we export. Excluding cars and parts, which are a rather special case, our trade deficit in manufactured goods increased by approximately \$1 billion between 1965 and 1970.

• (2030)

Canada's manufacturing industries have been particularly hard pressed during the past few years. Unit costs of production have risen more rapidly than those in the United States. The problem has been further compounded by the appreciation of the Canadian dollar, which has reduced the cost in Canada of imported manufactured goods and at the same time increased the cost of Canadian manufactured goods abroad. Our manufacturing sector has also been exposed to growing competition from the new industrial giants—Japan and the expanding European Economic Community. It has been further jeopardized by export subsidies and protectionist measures adopted or contemplated in the United States.

The manufacturing sector is of crucial importance to our economy. We depend on it to provide a growing number of productive, interesting and well-paying jobs for Canadians in the urban centres where they want to live and work. We rely on it to keep us in the forefront of technological changes. It is important to the development

The Budget—Hon. John N. Turner

of a balanced and stable economy, one that is not excessively exposed to the sharp swings that take place from time to time in demand abroad for raw materials. It is important, too, because of the support it provides to the other major sectors of the economy.

It is, therefore, essential for us to take whatever steps are necessary to promote the development in Canada of manufacturing industries that are dynamic, vigorous and resourceful, that are unceasing in their efforts to innovate, that develop new and better products and that are aggressive in their efforts to expand their markets in Canada and abroad. In short, we must do everything we can to promote the development of Canadian manufacturing industries that are fully capable of meeting and surpassing competition from other countries.

Budget Measures

Let me now get down to specifics. The thrust of the measures that I will propose to the House tonight has a two-fold purpose. The first set of measures is designed to strengthen the competitive position of our economy in order to promote the faster growth of production and employment. These measures are medium and long-term in their nature and structural in their impact. They are also intended as a permanent incentive. But they will also help to add new momentum immediately and in the months ahead to the already strong expansion now under way in the Canadian economy. The second set of measures is designed to promote greater social justice by relieving the financial burden that is being borne by particular groups or individuals in our nation. The new expenditures they entail will also add prompt stimulus to the economy.

As a major step in the development of a new industrial policy for this country I am bringing forward measures of a fundamental nature to revitalize the manufacturing and processing industries. These measures will help this sector improve its competitive position in the world and will thus protect existing jobs and provide well-paying new jobs for Canadians in and near the urban centres where they want to work. Moreover, these proposals will further reinforce growth throughout the economy by stimulating an early expansion in capital investment.

First, I propose that the cost of all machinery and equipment purchased after tonight by a taxpayer to be used for the purpose of manufacturing or processing goods for sale or lease in Canada may be written off in two years. A new capital cost allowance class will be established and a taxpayer will be entitled to claim as depreciation up to 50 per cent of the cost of the asset in the year in which it is acquired and the unclaimed balance in any subsequent year.

Second, commencing January 1, 1973, the top rate of corporate tax applicable to manufacturing and processing profits earned in Canada will be reduced to 40 per cent. Similarly, the effective rate of corporate tax applicable to manufacturing and processing profits earned in Canada eligible for the small business deduction will be reduced from 25 per cent to 20 per cent. In order to give effect to these rate reductions, it will be necessary to provide rules to enable a corporation to distinguish its manufacturing and processing income from other kinds of income, such as investment income, wholesaling and retailing income

The Budget—Hon. John N. Turner

and natural resource income. Special rules for this purpose will be included in the bill and in the regulations.

The natural resource industries will not qualify for the two-year fast write-off or the special reductions in the rate of corporate tax because there are already in existence other incentives better suited to the needs of these industries. However, I am introducing tonight a further incentive to encourage more processing of our mineral resources through smelting and refining in Canada. I propose that the class of expenditures which earn depletion be extended to include all equipment acquired after tonight for the purpose of processing in Canada mineral ores after extraction and up to the prime metal stage. This will include all processing, whether or not related to a new mine or a major expansion, as well as custom processing. Furthermore, I propose that all of the income from such processing operations be considered as income against which depletion may be claimed and in respect of which the 15 per cent provincial abatement will apply.

Of course, as mineral resources are processed beyond the prime metal stage and oil and gas are refined beyond the crude stage, these further activities will be considered manufacturing and processing and will, therefore, be eligible for both the fast write-off and the rate reduction.

Most machinery and equipment is now written off for tax purposes at a 20-per-cent rate on a declining balance method. Tonight's proposal will permit machinery and equipment required for manufacturing operations to be written off within two years. It will replace the measure introduced in December, 1970, whereby manufacturing and processing enterprises were permitted to value new investment in depreciable assets at 115 per cent of their actual cost.

These measures will serve to increase substantially the cash flow of manufacturers and processors. Until the present, manufacturing and processing companies in Canada have borne a considerable weight of the corporate income tax. The ratio of tax paid to the value of their output has been much higher for corporations in this field than for other goods-producing companies. The changes proposed tonight will, I believe, put them in a more equitable position.

• (2040)

The tax treatment of companies engaged in manufacturing and processing will now compare very favourably with that in other nations, particularly the United States and the enlarged Common Market countries. Accordingly, it is to be expected that these measures will provide a substantial incentive for the establishment in Canada of new manufacturing enterprises and the expansion of existing enterprises by increasing the return that can ultimately be realized on capital investment.

The increase in the flow of funds available to these industries will strengthen their ability to compete with foreign manufacturers in a variety of ways. They make use of these expanded resources to finance new research and development, to finance an expansion of productive capacity, to introduce new product lines and to finance the development of new cost-reducing methods.

The improved financial position of these enterprises should also significantly enhance their ability to meet

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

foreign competition in terms of price. With respect to those industries where there is at present a marked difference between Canadian and foreign price levels, I expect the savings permitted by these measures to be used to bring about a substantial reduction, and ultimately the elimination, of these price differentials.

Mr. Lewis: What is the expectation based upon?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Members of the House may ask what guarantee there is that this added cash flow will be used by our manufacturing industries for business expansion or to reduce prices, and not merely for higher profits. My answer is that I am confident that businessmen will see and recognize the underlying purpose of the government. Certainly we want to encourage a reasonable return on investment. But we also expect competitive prices, both at home and abroad. We expect the money to be used for new equipment and to replace equipment that is obsolescent. I expect business to get out and hustle, to grow, to compete, and to build jobs for Canadians. I am sure that the business community will justify this confidence and prove me right.

The measures which I am proposing to reinforce the expansion of manufacturing industries will be of benefit to all regions of the country. They will, of course, help to stimulate the growth of manufacturing in those areas of the country where it is already well developed. But they will also facilitate the establishment of new plants in those regions now relying heavily on resources. These regions are actively seeking to broaden their industrial base by promoting the development of manufacturing and processing.

This radical revision of the corporate tax system as it affects manufacturers and processors will require us to forego revenue amounting to about \$500 million in a full year. But these measures should not be regarded so much as a cost to the federal treasury as a major investment by the nation that over time will more than repay itself in terms of increasing jobs for our workers and increasing prosperity for all Canadians.

I also wish to announce tonight an extension for one year of the existing provisions permitting a fast write-off of capital expenditures made by manufacturers or producers to provide air and water pollution control. Thus, such machinery and equipment purchased at any time before the end of 1974, and buildings to house pollution control equipment which are started before the end of 1973, will be eligible for the fast write-off. These fast write-off provisions will also be broadened to cover the costs of buildings, machinery and equipment acquired by independent companies providing pollution control services.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to other proposals again directly affecting the welfare of individual Canadians.

Over a period of some months, growing concern has been expressed both by members of this House and the public generally about the threat posed to the financial security of some Canadian citizens who have little or no ability to protect themselves from the burden of rising living costs. I have in mind particularly the elderly, a large proportion of whom are women, those veterans receiving pensions to compensate them for disabilities suffered in

the military service of our country and families of veterans receiving the war veterans allowance.

Hon. members will recall that when the old age security program was amended and the guaranteed income supplement introduced six years ago, provision was made for the automatic escalation of both allowances up to a maximum of 2 per cent a year to offset increases in the cost of living.

[Translation]

Last year, further changes were made in the Old Age Security program and the supplemental allowance was raised substantially to provide greater assistance to those most in need. This rise in the supplemental payment made possible a real increase in the income of those eligible for the allowance because it more than compensated for increases in living costs prior to that time. At the same time, the provision for automatic escalation up to two per cent annually was retained for those qualifying for the combined Old Age Security and Guaranteed Income Supplement allowances. The universal Old Age Security pension was, however, fixed at \$80 a month in keeping with the move by the government to channel public funds in a more selective way in order to provide income support for those most in need.

During the past few months we have been re-examining two features of the present program that have become a matter of public concern, the limitation on the annual increase in the combined Old Age Security and Guaranteed Income Supplement of two per cent annually and the pegging of the universal Old Age Security pension alone at \$80. There are many elderly people who do not require the supplemental allowance to maintain a reasonable standard of living because they were able to make some provision for their own retirement during the period they were working. Even with the Old Age Security pension, however, the income of such elderly Canadians is in many cases already quite moderate and its purchasing power continues to be reduced by the rising cost of living.

Those receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement are also in a difficult position. If prices rise by more than two per cent a year—which has been the case recently—their real incomes will deteriorate unless there are periodic amendments to the legislation to provide for regular increases in these benefits.

[English]

In the long-term interests of the economy as a whole, it is essential for us to continue our efforts to maintain reasonable price stability in Canada. But these elderly Canadians are by no means responsible for the cost pressures that develop in our economy. On the contrary, they are the chief victims of inflation because they are the least able of any group in our society to protect themselves against it. We have come to the conclusion, therefore, that we have a duty as a nation to ensure that the elderly and veterans will be relieved of the hardship of a declining standard of living by helping them to meet the burden of the rising costs. I think everyone would agree that these are very special groups.

• (2050)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

25316—4!

The Budget—Hon. John N. Turner

Mr. Muir: When did you discover that?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): In order to provide the needed relief and assistance to elderly Canadians, the government is proposing a number of measures. First, we shall seek authority to provide that the old age security pension should increase in accord with the full increase in the cost of living. This change would be made effective as of January 1, 1972, with the monthly payment being escalated by the percentage increase in the consumer price index in the fiscal year 1971-72 over the fiscal year 1970-71.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): How much is that?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Beginning next year, the monthly pension would be adjusted on April 1 of each fiscal year to reflect the full rise in the cost of living during the previous calendar year.

Mr. Muir: Pierre said inflation was over.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Second, the advance in the economy and the national income now makes possible a further across the board increase in the guaranteed income supplement for needy, elderly Canadians. As of January 1, 1972, the maximum monthly benefit payable under a combined old age security/guaranteed income supplement would be raised from \$135 for a single person to \$150, and for a married couple from \$255 to \$285.

Mr. Lewis: That's the only good thing in the budget.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Further, the present ceiling of 2 per cent on the annual escalation index would be removed, so that on April 1 next year, this maximum benefit would also be increased in step with the full increase in the cost of living.

My colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, will introduce amendments to the Old Age Security Act to bring these changes into effect.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It's about time!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Third, the special exemption allowed persons 65 years of age and over for income tax purposes, which was recently increased by this government from \$500 to \$650, will be raised still further to \$1,000.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: What about that, George?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): They are delirious.

Mr. Horner: It's a good thing an election comes every four years.

An hon. Member: We should have an election every year.

The Budget—Hon. John N. Turner

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): This increased exemption will also be extended to taxpayers who are confined to bed or a wheelchair, and to the blind. I also wish to announce a further measure related to the blind and persons who are confined to bed or a wheelchair.

Mr. Jamieson: The Tories!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): To the extent that a blind or disabled person cannot make use of the \$1,000 exemption, his or her spouse will be entitled to claim the otherwise unused portion of that exemption. Both of these measures will be effective from January 1, 1972.

In a full year the added expenditures resulting from the full escalation of the pensions for the aged, together with the increase in the maximum OAS/GIS benefit and the increase in the exemptions for the elderly, the blind and the disabled will cost about \$350 million.

The government's concern for elderly persons has also led us to consider whether some fresh, new approach should not be undertaken on their behalf. It is obviously important that the growing number of men and women reaching retirement years should have opportunities to continue to participate in the life of the community in a meaningful way. Towards this end, my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, will shortly announce details of an experimental program to be known as *New Horizons for the Aged*.

Like the elderly, many of those Canadian veterans who made sacrifices in defence of our country—and their families—also find it difficult, if not impossible, to defend themselves against rising costs of living.

There have been periodic increases in the war veterans pension and war veterans allowances, the most recent being only last year. But the real income provided by these payments is in danger of being eroded by mounting prices. It is only fair and reasonable that we should stand ready to protect veterans and their families against such hardship as a matter of right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: It took you four years to realize that.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I propose, therefore, that effective January 1, 1972, pensions and allowances paid to war veterans also be increased from year-to-year in accordance with the full increase in the cost of living. We estimate the cost of this step will be about \$25 million in a full year.

My colleague, the Minister of Veterans Affairs, will shortly be introducing amendments to the Pensions' Act and the War Veterans' Allowance Act to give effect to these changes.

I am convinced the vast majority of Canadians will welcome these improvements, particularly those who will benefit directly—the elderly and veterans and their dependants—and those sons and daughters and other relatives who help to support them. I am sure that all members of the House will give wholehearted support to these important changes. With respect to escalation of pensions for the elderly and veterans, I want to stress again that these are very special groups and the same case

cannot, in my judgment, necessarily be made for other groups.

[*Translation*]

I come now to a further area of public concern. This has to do with the growing financial burdens that must be carried by students—or by their husbands or their wives or their parents, as the case may be—in meeting the rising costs incurred in pursuing higher education or training for a vocational career.

It has been customary to think of education and training in terms of that undertaken largely by young Canadians as a necessary preparation for subsequent employment. Increasingly, however, education and training is becoming a continuing process. More and more adult men and women are resuming their studies to advance their education or training or to engage in re-training for new occupations in order to meet the requirements of our rapidly changing industrial society. This is particularly true of married women, who in growing numbers want to become qualified to obtain interesting, well-paying jobs after the early years of raising their families.

• (2100)

At the present time, of course, students may, for tax purposes, deduct from their annual earnings the full amount of their tuition fees. However, there are other costs of increasing importance which are not taken into account in any way. First there is the loss of income that might otherwise have been earned by a student. This forgone income is a major consideration in the decision whether to undertake or continue education or training. Second, there is the problem of the immediate cash costs that must be carried—of ordinary living, transportation, books and so forth. These costs have been climbing and there is evidence to suggest that they are weighing heavily against decisions to proceed with education or training.

To be sure, there have been valid concerns expressed about the very sharp rise in the amount of money which governments have had to pour into the educational system to cope with expanding enrolments and increasing costs. But a large part of this can be traced to the age structure of our population, which has resulted in a large inflow of students. This demographic phenomenon is now reversing, and we need to ensure that over the longer run Canada places an adequate emphasis on the development of our human resources. Taking this longer view, the federal government has concluded that some steps should be taken through the tax system to encourage the effort of individual students and their families to invest in further education and vocational training.

I therefore propose a new deduction related to the cost of obtaining education, which will be in addition to the existing deduction for tuition fees. This new measure will be a deduction of \$50 per month per student for each month in the year during which the student was in full-time attendance at certain educational or training institutions. It will be applied to full-time attendance in a qualifying educational program at educational institutions providing courses at the post-secondary level and also at educational institutions certified by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in connection with the present tax provision affecting tuition fees. For these purposes, a

qualifying educational program will mean a program of not less than three consecutive weeks' duration that requires the student to work not less than 10 hours per week at work related to the program. Those eligible for training allowances or whose courses are paid for by their employer will not be eligible for this deduction.

The deduction will be available to the student, but to the extent that she or he cannot make full use of the deduction, it will be available to the student's parent, husband or wife. This deduction will be effective as from January 1, 1972. It will involve a revenue cost of about \$50 million in a full year.

[English]

Mr. Speaker, a further proposal affecting individuals relates to medical expenses. For most taxpayers, the introduction of publicly-financed programs for hospital and medical care has greatly reduced the number of cases whereby medical expenses place an unusual burden upon a taxpayer. None the less, this is an area which requires continuing surveillance to make sure that the hardship cases are dealt with quickly and adequately.

In keeping with this policy, I wish to announce two new measures. First, I propose to include as a medical expense for tax purposes an amount paid as remuneration for a full-time attendant to care for a taxpayer, his spouse, or other dependant, in a domestic establishment in which the cared-for person resides. This will be available upon certification by a doctor that the person is incapable of self-care for what is likely to be an indefinite period.

Secondly, I propose to include as a deductible medical expense amounts paid to commercial transport services for transportation of a taxpayer or his spouse, or dependant, and an attendant if necessary, to and from a hospital, clinic or doctor's office to which the individual has travelled a distance in excess of 25 miles to obtain medical services not otherwise available nearer home.

Both of these measures that I have just announced will help to relieve financial hardship associated with illness.

[Translation]

A number of the income tax measures I have just outlined and others related to tax reform that I will outline shortly will have an effect on the revenues of all provinces which have harmonized their tax systems with ours for purposes of tax collection agreements. These effects may be quite substantial. However, we have already provided a guarantee to these provinces that their revenues will be maintained for five years at a level at least equal to that which they would have received under the former tax system. This guarantee was offered as a part of tax reform and is contained in the fiscal arrangements legislation recently enacted by Parliament. The guarantee means that the federal government will absorb any revenue cost that the provinces otherwise would have borne, if the combined effect of tax reform and the new measures proposed tonight reduces provincial revenues below the yield of the former tax system. I am confident, moreover, that the provincial governments will welcome these measures as contributing both to the longer-term growth of their respective provinces and to fairness in taxation.

The Budget—Hon. John N. Turner

I am bringing forward certain proposals tonight regarding the sales tax, most of which involve items that are of concern to those Canadians who are physically handicapped. I also wish to announce that in order to provide a further measure of support to industrial research and development in Canada, scientific research equipment purchased by manufacturers after tonight for use in the testing or development of new products will be exempt from sales tax. Details of these proposals will be found in the Ways and Means Motion that I will table later.

I would like to turn now to the Customs Tariff. The terms of the Canadian offer of tariff preferences for developing countries were announced in the House on November 14, 1969. The proposed Canadian system is also set out in the Ways and Means Motion which I am tabling tonight. It proposes the establishment of a "General Preferential Tariff" which, subject to appropriate safeguards, will provide for lower tariffs on most of the semi-manufactured and manufactured goods which we import from developing countries.

There is also provision for lower rates on selected agricultural products and industrial raw materials. This will be enabling legislation; it will come into force only after enactment and on a date to be fixed by proclamation. This is a contribution by Canada to a global effort to help the developing countries improve their exports to world markets.

There are a number of other tariff changes which I am proposing. Most of these are relatively minor in their economic impact; the details are set out in the Ways and Means Motion. I should mention one which is of importance to the textile industry. The duty on knit goods from Britain is to be increased from a net rate of 18 per cent to 25 per cent; the rate on knit goods from other countries entitled to the benefits of the British Preferential Tariff will remain the same. This proposal derives from negotiations following upon the implementation by Britain on January 1 this year of increased rates of duty on cotton textiles from Commonwealth sources, including those from Canada. The purpose is to restore the balance of our concessions in our trade agreement with Britain. It should benefit our textile industry, which was damaged by the increased British tariff on cotton textiles.

It should be noted that as Britain begins to alter preferential access to its market by its entry into the European Economic Community, Canada will no longer have an obligation to extend preferential rates on British goods.

As in previous budgets, all the changes—except those relating to the proposed General Preferential Tariff—are to come into force tomorrow.

[English]

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to refer to tax reform. Last December, Bill C-259 received royal assent and on January 1, 1972, the amended Income Tax Act came into effect. Only a few months have passed, but as a general observation, I am pleased to note that, except in a few specific areas, debate about broad policy issues seems to have run its course.

This is not to say that everyone is satisfied with tax reform and I myself am concerned about some of the provisions which have produced anomalies or which are

