

another oil well in Alberta or in the north, or anywhere else in the country, and it just sits there gurgling away and producing almost no employment.

However, it is the manufacturing sector of the economy, as the former finance minister said when he was in opposition—and that might be significant—which is adversely affected by our tax system. We pour money directly into the resource sector by not taxing it at the same level as we do the manufacturing sector. The result is we have a disproportionate amount of capital investment going into the resource sector and not enough into the manufacturing sector, where it should be. What we need right now, to get back to the motion, is to create a greater sense of fairness. That means greater employment. What we need is a tax increase in the resource sector of the economy which will have, as an effect, the rechanneling of investment into the manufacturing sector.

This government has been quite consistent in its tax policy. It takes great pride in consistency and consistent stupidity. I suppose it would prefer to be consistent rather than make an intelligent and just change. Let me conclude with a practical recommendation. We have now in our foreign reserves almost \$6 billion. If we intend to keep our dollar floating, and particularly if we intend to maintain a clean float, as the economists say, there is no need for that little depository of money to simply sit around. A couple of years ago I argued that we should use a good part of the reserves—I believe the amount then was around \$3 billion—to buy a controlling interest in the petroleum industry of Canada. I argued that this would make very good economic sense. This is a growth industry, and with control we could carry out our own research and development in Canada by employing Canadian scientists. This would lead to the development of new projects.

Has my time expired, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member cannot ask a question of the Chair, but I will tell him that his time has expired.

• (1630)

[Translation]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, in speeches delivered both inside and outside this House the Creditistes have often quoted as an example the building of the Jacques Cartier bridge which everybody knows and which was built according to official figures at a cost of \$18,571,308.71. At the present, the taxpayers of this country have paid in interest only for that bridge the amount of \$20,198,266.33 and there is still \$14,065,605.39 to be paid on the principal.

As we have already said on several occasions, Mr. Speaker, this is dreadful nonsense. A nonsense that the Creditistes undertake to do away with as soon as they have taken over. This should happen soon because the people of Canada have their fill with paying two or three times the actual cost of a product or service they require when it would be possible to build bridges or schools, to carry out various public works without the taxpayers being called upon to pay the cost of two or three bridges when they only get the use of one.

Under the Creditist system, Mr. Speaker, finance is nothing else but facts expressed in terms of accounting. If a production takes place, we write down in the credit

Alleged Decentralization of Policies

column the value of what has been produced. If that production is consumed or destroyed we write down in the debit column the value of what has been consumed or destroyed. Under a creditist regime we would not be asking ourselves questions such as: Do we have the money? Can we pay? Can we borrow? How are we going to pay back?

Has a bridge become necessary? Is a new school being called for? The only question those in charge will have to ask themselves is this, can we build the bridge? Can we build the school that is being called for and needed?

Whether we can build a school or a bridge or not, Mr. Speaker, does not boil down to, do we have the money? It is a matter of, do we have materials, wood, brick, tools, engineers, technicians, workers, to build it?

We, of the Social Credit party, know that the real credit of a country, of a province or of a municipality lies in the productive capacity of that country, that province or that municipality. That is the real credit.

Financial credit should, on the other hand, reflect the real credit. Financial credit should then derive from society itself or rather from a monetary institution which could well be the central bank, which operates on behalf of society and on its instructions. This monetary institution which is only a book-keeping instrument, could well be the Bank of Canada at the national level, or a Quebec institution at that province's level, in case the Quebec government and that of other provinces should take the initiative if Ottawa refused to do so.

But let us assume that the Social Credit party is in power in Ottawa and that the incumbent Postmaster General wants to build a post office somewhere or that the Minister of Transport and Communications wants to put up a bridge between Montreal and the south shore. The ministers concerned would submit their projects to parliament and the members would decide whether they can be physically carried out and whether they meet actual needs. In no way do the members have to ask themselves whether they have the money or not. They only have to consider whether these projects meet actual needs and are physically possible. This means that the members will have to agree if the productive capacity of the country allows it to carry out these projects while still providing the goods required by the private sector. The decision of parliament to allow the construction of a post office or a bridge has nothing to do with any financial concern. In order to reflect realities, finance will have to play its part. The credit board or central bank would have nothing to decide, nothing to dictate with regard to the carrying out of the project. It would merely finance the construction of the bridge and make the required entries in a national ledger.

Let us suppose a \$10 million bridge is to be built across the St. Lawrence. In his tender, the contractor would have provided for the expenditures; the purchase of materials, labour, transportation and the cost of money. But where would he get the money to pay his bills from day to day if he is short of cash? From financial institutions, banks, for instance.

Under a créditiste government, the banks would continue to exist, to make loans and give credit. They could lend