

*The Budget—Hon. M. Lambert*

international field? What company from western Canada, for example, would enter into a joint arrangement with Japanese industrialists in the absence of some greater certainty as to its future position? Oil and drilling operations are now limited in Canada. Take the position of a Canadian company which is operating in the North Sea, or elsewhere, through a subsidiary, or in partnership with foreign companies. Is such a company likely to go forward with its plans without knowing what the future is likely to be? Remember, all that these companies have been exposed to so far is the philosophy of Bill C-259 and, what is worse, of the white paper before it. The minister has said: I intend to put off the evil day until 1975. If I were a Canadian businessman considering the possibility of expanding overseas, Mr. Speaker, I would stay home. The minister must come to an early decision. There is no room for a postponement until 1975 at this point. It is totally wrong. How many companies have already transferred their headquarters?

• (1610)

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Name them.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** There are some. It is wrong to say "Name them", because by then the decision to move will have been taken, and there is no way in which the minister or anyone else can go cap in hand to a board of directors and say, "Please come back." This is an area in which we are bound to be competitive, an area in which it is necessary to compete with others on equal or on better terms. Just because someone says there has to be a certain amount of so-called equity in taxation, and someone in government says "A buck is a buck" a decision is made to tax business companies, even though the money has not yet been received by them, even though under the laws of the country in which the investment has taken place, in which the operation has taken place, it may not be remitted, even though the Canadian concern might own only a minority interest and cannot get the money home, the Canadian company is to be obliged to count this money as income and be taxed on it. What sort of hamstringing philosophy is that?

I am disappointed in this budget. I expected a great deal from the minister, having heard certain statements from him in the past expressing what I had hoped would be his philosophy, a philosophy which recognized that the Canadian economy works on the basis of incentives; that it should be encouraged; that it should feel the government is behind it, not on its back. But the government is exacting from the economy ever more hundreds of millions of dollars each year. One has only to look at the tables of government revenue and expenditure to realize how true this is. All this money comes from only one place. Every blessed last dollar comes out of the pockets of Canadians, people living and working in Canada. The government, of course, takes credit for redistributing it. It distributes largesse. All it is doing is taking money out of one pocket, putting it into another, and saying "What good boys we are; we are giving it back to you this way". As I say, I am terribly disappointed, and therefore, seconded by my hon. friend from Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell), I move:

That while acknowledging certain beneficial provisions—

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Isn't there something missing? Shouldn't you move to delete all the words after "That"?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. There has been a certain hiatus. The motion should read:

That all the words after "that" be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

While acknowledging certain beneficial provisions in the budget proposals, this House regrets the failure of the government to bring forth effective measures to relieve unemployment, to provide incentive for Canadian investment in Canadian development or to propose personal tax relief for stimulation of the economy.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Don't you have any drafters on that side?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The Chair was about to raise this technicality, the relationship of the amendment to the motion before us. We shall make the necessary arrangements so that the motion provides for the removal of all the words after "that".

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, on March 3 the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) placed a question on the order paper. It read as follows:

In the years 1957 and 1967, what percentage of the total money income was received by the (a) lowest one-fifth (b) second lowest fifth (c) third lowest fifth (d) fourth lowest fifth and (e) highest fifth of all family units?

A reply was tabled a few weeks ago and, to the amazement of everyone who examined it, it clearly showed that in the ten years between 1957 and 1967 there has been no appreciable change in the way in which income is distributed in Canada. And this despite all the vaunted programs brought in by the Liberal party and by the Conservatives before them aimed, it was said, at the redistribution of income. The distribution of income in this country remains essentially the same. The columnist, Douglas Fisher, simply took this information and printed it in the paper for which he writes, offering only a very limited amount of comment, something which, for Mr. Fisher, is unusual. This is a case, though, where the facts speak for themselves and additional comment is scarcely needed.

The other day, in the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, the Chairman, the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) was obviously in a state of agitation. He asked the officials from Statistics Canada, who were appearing before the committee, to come prepared to state whether these figures were correct or not. I should like to quote from the minutes of that Committee for May 4, at page 11. The hon. member for Don Valley addressing the representatives of Statistics Canada had this to say:

• (1620)

I am not satisfied with the information that you have. I appreciate that you are giving us all there is, certainly I am prepared to accept that, but I am not satisfied that enough priority has been given by Statistics Canada to this area. I would just like to tell you that, to me, this is one of the most serious allegations I have ever seen made against the government that in the last X years, whatever it is there has been no significant or any redistribution of income. I think it is very important for the credibility of Parliament, if you like, that there has been movement. If it does not show in the dollars, but there are redistribution programs and