

Establishment of Industry Department

promises they made to the Canadian people in the last general election.

Still talking on industry I draw one example, and one example only. To bring in a comprehensive medicare and health scheme would cost \$1 billion, and if you add that to what it costs to operate the bureaucracy, \$1.57 million, it takes up more than a third of the budget. On top of that there is the cost of defence. How can we ever hope to cut taxes? Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with that particular subject right now.

I said before that if the government were going to carry out its promises with regard to a health scheme it would mean an increase in expenditure of \$1 billion, plus a new system of taxation which would lower the wages earned by the wage earners and also lower the profits of industry. If industry could keep the money or a part of the money that goes into supporting bureaucracy, then it could cut its cost of production, resulting in a lower cost of goods to the consumers in Canada and enabling Canadian industry to compete in world markets.

I say without any hesitation that if taxes were cut, labour unions would not be prone to ask for wage increases. Lots of times we ask ourselves why they are asking for wage increases. I would like to ask in reply, how many families living on the wages they are earning today, even though they are high, have enough left over after they pay their taxes to provide a home and maintenance for their families. If industry could retain part of the money it pays in taxes it would not have to go to organizations of bureaucracy to borrow money to finance expansion, such as the industrial bank of Canada.

The individual has only to earn around \$15,000 in this country at present before he is required to pay 47 cents on every dollar he makes. Just think of the cost of that partnership. The biggest partner any business has in this country is the federal government. I do not need to outline the amount of taxes paid by corporations, but they cannot expand their operations when they are faced with such a high scale of taxation.

When the Liberals were in opposition they said they would cut taxes, but with the steps they are now taking they are going to make the Canadian people pay through the eye. Mind you, Mr. Chairman, my words are going to be borne out. This is the sort of thing which is a further step to create a complete welfare state, and I do not think there is much difference between a complete welfare state and this type of suggested legislation. The government is acting as a nursemaid to industry and is attempting to get into private

[Mr. Woolliams.]

business in the same way it has gone into welfare enterprises.

Under that kind of system the ambition and initiative of man is removed. Under it, the will of man is not shattered but softened, bent and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but are constantly restrained from acting. It prevents existence; it does not tyrannize but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes and stupefies a people until a nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious folks of which the government is the shepherd. When we reach this conclusion we have then conformed as a socialist state, because there is no difference between the final result of that process and the final result of socialism or the final result of communism.

The socialist state expropriates your property and pays you for it later, sometimes five or six years later. Under the social welfare state, the state takes your profit and is the biggest partner in industry and business. What then is the difference between a complete welfare state and a socialist state? They are only different forms of expropriation. Under communism the state takes your property and your profits, operates your business, and the state ends up with the same amount of control.

I say now without any reservation that I am personally opposed to setting up a new department to enlarge the bureaucracy of our country. Talking about socialisms, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the Liberals have out-socialized the socialists in Canada. The right wingers of the Liberal party are the members of the New Democratic party. Facts are facts, and what makes the strangest of facts is that there are so many millionaires sitting on the treasury benches, and they want to socialize everybody except themselves. Perhaps they have in mind the final result so far as bureaucracy is concerned.

I think George Bernard Shaw described the end very well in "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism" when he said:

I also make it quite clear that socialism means equality of income or nothing, and that under socialism you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught and employed whether you liked it or not. If it were discovered that you had not character and industry to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner, but whilst you were permitted to live, you would have to live well.

That is the final result of the kind of bureaucracy which is building up in this country. I know this is rather an exaggeration so far as the socialists are concerned. They do not like it; nevertheless they would force the individual into this or that. They would tell industry it could go into this