

The Budget—Mr. C. Cameron

ourselves for the production and distribution of resources. I have always felt that in a modern state the goal of civilized state should be that of developing as far as possible an egalitarian society. I am not suggesting, here, any counsel of perfection; indeed, if that were possible, it might not be desirable.

We still have an immense number who are incentives. We have heard a lot about that this morning from the Official Opposition. I agree there must be incentives which will induce people to undertake the rigorous and lengthy training and education required to fill the most skilled positions in our society. But incentives used merely to encourage people to seek the most profitable places for investment land us in the state in which we find ourselves today where, in spite of the long and unprecedented economic growth, 25 per cent of our people are still living near poverty level.

● (2:40 p.m.)

We still have an immense number who are living in stringent circumstances and on whom, apparently, we must impose taxes. We still have old people, retired civil servants and disabled people living at substandard levels, and we still have a totally defective educational machine in this country incapable of producing the very productive force that the Minister of Finance tells us we must have.

Therefore I suggest we should not look merely at statistics. Statistics do not give us the real picture of our egalitarian society. We hear no mention of all the extra income acquired by those who happen to be in a position of prosperity. We hear no mention of the man who has a \$50,000 home and who draws considerable income from the fact that he lives in this home and enjoys its amenities. He does not get taxed on that. I suggest that until some future government recognizes that we must divorce the idea of livelihood from that of a piece of machinery in a large productive machine we are going to have this continual trouble. We are going to continue to the point of expanding our economy and then being told that, because we are in an inflationary position, we cannot provide larger pensions for old people, and provide education as it should be provided, and cannot reduce income tax levels because we need the revenues.

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

This is because the whole of our society is geared to the production of profits, to the maldistribution of wealth in order that those who own and operate the productive forces of society may draw their first tribute from it and leave us the rest. If this continues we are going to have more throw-outs because of technological changes, but somehow we will have to achieve some means of distributing the wealth that automation and cybernation have made possible. This is one of the great opportunities for mankind, but if we are going to have the sort of program presented by the Minister of Finance in his budget we are going to lose that opportunity and from our wealth possibilities we are going to create more and more misery for more and more people.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): The question is on the subamendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, the night the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) brought down his budget I could not help but note that the most wonderful progress there was in that budget speech was the one made by the minister in his manner of expressing himself in French. That was the greatest improvement, and I think the Liberal members will agree with me. As a matter of fact, to me, it was the only improvement because, apart from that, the speech was rather disappointing and fairly rough.

In a certain way, the Minister of Finance reminded me of some finance minister in a country where people are complaining about a shortage of hats due to an increase in population. So, they consult their economists. The first one replies; well, we shall build factories and they will manufacture hats. No, says the second one, we shall cut off heads and then there will be enough hats. That is exactly what our Minister of Finance has done in his 1966 budget. He cut off heads, he cut down the number of public works, and he asked the provinces to do as much. He also asked the industrial and manufacturing interests to cut down on their investments.

Everything is in progress, but man no longer knows what to do with progress. There are too many heads? Let us cut them off. Too much progress? Let us try and restrict it.

That is not the way to develop a country, Mr. Speaker. One never develops the economy of a country or the country itself by trying to limit its growth but by encouraging it.