

Instead of giving one's confidence to pragmatic people, we need thinkers who can keep pace with the realities of an economic world forever progressing. Production is carried out with modern methods, but distribution is done with old-fashioned ones, when it should be carried out in a modern way.

The greater the production, the lesser the consumption. The greater the capitalization, the lesser the distribution. And that is another problem that all citizens and all hon. members should take into consideration.

In the search for profit, for capital, for power, for domination, one forgets that it is for man that one produces, that it is man that must benefit from production and even from capitalization.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Powerful and manageable systems and organizations as well as monetary, economic and political machinery were set up. They produced \$90 billion in 1971 which could fulfil everyone's needs while guaranteeing sufficient capital and all necessary investments. But they prefer to bury useless and cumbersome billions of dollars which create inflation and should be used as a purchasing power for people without any income so that every family may enjoy a decent standard of living and all citizens wishing to contribute to the national production may find work.

Without reducing any of the personal income, salary, interests, capital or dividends of those companies listed on the stock market, we could draw from hidden reserves which are neither declared nor taxed on consumption in order to insure a right to live for dependent citizens without work or capital in each and every home in Canada.

If we wanted to open our eyes, we could lower the cost of living, and allow Canadians to increase their income as our national production would rise. Today, our national production goes up and the income of most Canadians goes down. Our total corporate interests are showing a mere \$6 billion of taxable profits as assigned to dividends and undistributed benefits—according to their public reports—but they manage to build up huge depreciation reserves and capital funds, to some extent with the blessing of our governments, the total of which might reach \$24 billion for 1971.

Those tangible, inconspicuous or secret reserves, concealed in obscure annual reports by the people, not even by chartered accountants and experts, can be used to guarantee the security of the social national capital.

Why not put more emphasis on the vital human right of the family? Why could we not respect the rights and prerogatives of the human being? Why are we unable to resolve the unemployment problem which is getting worse every day? As a matter of fact, as we increase taxes of all kinds, more unemployment is being created, more citizens are dispossessed, destitute, discouraged for they can no longer cope with our present economic system which should enable them to enjoy a social life, a respectable life in a country bursting with wealth which we are not even able to distribute. There is no poverty in this country, there is undistributed riches. Since we live in an affluent society, let us organize the distribution of wealth. Therefore, this bill should contain the principle of distribution

of this wealth to secure an income, a stable economy for everyone.

[English]

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few words to the debate on the amendment which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) proposed to the tax reform bill. In a few days this bill will become the law of the country, with all the benefits it will bring to many taxpayers through reduced taxes. One of the sidelights of this debate has been the fact that the rule respecting time allocation has been invoked. This principle—

**Mr. Alexander:** Closure, you mean.

**Mr. Foster:** The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) keeps using the wrong word. He has not thoroughly read the rule book or he would know that the phrase is "time allocation." This principle was adopted in July 1969, but has not been used until now. That is regrettable because, I believe, like many of the younger members who came here first in 1968, we should be moving toward handling the work of the House in a more orderly fashion. It seems to me that unless we find a system to do this using rules 75A, 75B or 75C or some other parliamentary device, we will continue to waste a lot of time and this House will rapidly become more irrelevant.

Members are in the House for much of the year, 10 or 11 months, and spend a shorter and shorter period of time in their ridings, taking weekend flying trips which most of us have learned to live with over the last few years. If we could adopt a system of programming our work, we might be able to spend one week in every eight in our constituencies. If we were to do this, we could better reflect the wishes of our constituents.

I compliment the three or four members of the official opposition who are in the chamber tonight. They are here at great personal sacrifice. The position of the opposition parties on this bill has been most interesting. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) would like to split the bill, taking all the goodies now, all the tax cuts which are proposed, and leaving all the other parts of the bill to be implemented at a later date. But he has never specified exactly when. That must be one of the most unworkable proposals ever made. It is like the man who says, "Well, I'll take my pay cheque but I won't bother paying any of my bills." The administrative complications of this proposal would make the tax jungle of the 1930s look like a formal garden by comparison.

The Leader of the Opposition says that he does not understand the tax bill. We will go along with that. We are inclined to agree that he does not understand it. After all, Mr. Speaker, he could not remember when he got a copy of the bill. He thought it came in just a couple of days before Parliament opened on September 7, when in fact the bill was distributed to every member of the House on July 12.

**Mr. MacInnis:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I rise not only to question the hon. member's ability to count but to remind him that the tax bill now before the House was delivered from the Queen's Printer only within the last week. Therefore, his assessment as to when this bill