

The traditional structures having disappeared, government participation in assuring early recognition of the claims of underprivileged groups is required if this recognition is not forthcoming, if the liberated forces are not recognized, those same forces will wreck our society. Obviously, the government cannot sit back and allow this to happen. This is one of the reasons government must take upon itself a larger role in the society of the 'seventies.

In the economy, similar changes are taking place. When I studied economics just a few years ago at the University of Toronto, our analyses were based on a concept called equilibrium. We would analyse a condition of equilibrium and then, depending on circumstances, we would review certain movements which caused disequilibrium—increases in cost, decline in demand, increase in the money supply and so on. This concept of equilibrium came to us unchanged from the 19th Century, from the works of Adam Smith in 1867. Today it is recognized that there is no such thing as equilibrium in actual fact. Old economic ideas have to be discarded. Natural forces do not preserve competition, they do not maintain the marketplace, they do not assure power to bargain, they do not provide adequate liquidity either domestically or internationally. Neither will natural forces maintain a strong Canadian presence in the Canadian economy. The need for constant government intervention and participation is so obvious in a modern economy that we have reached a point at which the absence of government presence from a problem area can itself be regarded as an expression of national policy.

When the critics label government presence in the economy as socialism or as a movement towards a state economy, they are missing the point. So far, the policies of the Liberal government have been largely designed to create an artificial state of equilibrium. As Peter F. Drucker of the Harvard Business School has observed, the modern economic equilibrium which we try to create is, at best, something like a bicycle which can only balance while it is moving. This so-called government interference is really an operation designed to preserve free enterprise and protect economic opportunity, not to replace them. This, at any rate, is the position I take and it is the position of the Liberal party as I understand it.

The Budget—Mr. Kaplan

So this is another area in which the function of government is misunderstood and labelled socialism.

We can only hope that as the country becomes more involved in the process of government—and it ought to become more involved—the Canadian people will consider government decisions not in the context of what was done in the past, but in the light of the alternatives available, recognizing that the lessons of the past are not entirely relevant. It is a matter of choosing among alternative courses of conduct, those which will assure the maintenance of the values in which Canadians believe.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I have a few minutes left, I will accept your suggestion and read the table into the record. The table is headed: Federal Government Employees, and Canada Total Employees. The figures given are from March 31, 1952 to December, 1969. I shall read four figures, the first being the year, the second being the absolute number of federal employees, the third being the total number of persons employed in Canada and the fourth being the percentage of federal employees to the total number. For 1952, 131,646 of 5,169,000, being 2.5 per cent. For 1953, 163,192 of 5,235,000, being 3.1 per cent. For 1954—

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This question was raised the other day and I thought it had finally been resolved along the lines that an hon. member could file a table as long as he could identify its origin. This procedure would certainly make a lot more sense than having to read all those figures. The House is the master of its own rules. Your Honour has correctly pointed out that this is not the practice, but the hon. member who thought that he did have an objection is not in the House at the moment. I should like to ask the hon. member a question before his time runs out.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member is right, but the problem has been resolved by the hon. member in his own way.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, may I press you to reconsider and to permit me to file them?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Does the House give unanimous consent?