

Distribution of Goods and Services

An hon. Member: This is not true!

Mr. Kierans: —and more closing down of plants.

I wish I could propose to the people of Canada a means of receiving without giving. I regret to say so, but such a policy does not exist. It is a myth: the Social Credit myth.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I could hear the speeches which have been delivered since the beginning of the debate on the motion moved by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) that says:

That, in the opinion of the house, the government has failed to take adequate measures in order to give Canadians the benefit of a policy of distribution of goods and services which would allow each citizen to obtain his share of Canadian abundance.

This afternoon, we had the opportunity to hear a speech by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and one by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) who could not do any better than resume the minister's arguments, for Conservatives and Liberals are the same, there is nothing different about them—and we have just heard the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) who is also the hon. member for Duvernay and, has in his turn, just taken the floor and tried to lead people astray.

Mr. Speaker, I will try by all means to be more positive and honest than those who spoke before me on this motion now before us, because we believe this to be a basic problem that must be considered objectively.

This motion is an attempt to get at the root of the problem, the basic evil of the Canadian monetary system. I want the Minister of Communications to listen to the simultaneous translation, because he seems to understand English better than French. I hope that the knowledge we want to impart to him will show the side of the poor people, to him who always lived among the rich when he was with the Stock Exchange.

It is about time for them, Mr. Speaker, to look at the other side of the coin and to find out that 68 per cent of Canadian workers make less than \$4,000 per year; those people are in a better position to understand what we mean by saying that the government did not take appropriate measures to allow an honest and equitable distribution of goods.

Those who had an easy life, with campaign funds and high finance, cannot understand what we tell them.

[Mr. Kierans.]

That is why, Mr. Speaker, 68 per cent of all Canadians, whose income is \$4,000 or less, according to the answer I got from question No. 636 I had put on the order paper, those people do understand.

They do not necessarily react as the Hon. Minister of Regional Economic Expansion would have us believe this afternoon, when he said that the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) was making a laughing-stock of himself.

Mr. Speaker, we do not make a laughing-stock of ourselves, we tell people the truth, we tell it like it is. This government does not make people laugh, it makes them cry, because it is not open and above-board. It tells people: "Vote for the great and fine Liberal party, vote for a majority government, and you will have a just society." And what do we see: The rich are getting richer and richer and wealth is concentrated in fewer hands, as time goes by; the poor are getting poorer and poorer, and they increase in number. This is what the present government brought about.

Mr. Speaker, through the ages all the great social issues had one question in common: how to distribute the wealth created by production.

Let us define our terms, because many people seem unable to understand them. They have ears and hear not—and they have not heard since the very beginning of this debate. This has to stop, because we want this discussion to be constructive.

First let us consider capital. We can agree on a definition. In our views, it is the amount of money needed to process raw material, to convert it into something else; this is done both by men, workers, farmers or others, and by machine, that is to say through automation.

Then there is work, another term which we must define together. To us, it is an element of production the capital, provided by the worker. Work, either by man or by machine is a capital of sorts and a factor of production, under the impulse of the financial capital provided by the employer.

Therefore, theoretically, those agents which all contribute to production must be given a share in proportion to their cooperation. However, it goes without saying that this distribution is not made between abstract entities, but between real beings, which have obligations to meet, i.e., between human beings.