

The Address—Mrs. Wadds

simpler society. Our dependency on communications, on transportation, on electricity and on machinery gives us a rigidity and the conscious or unconscious fear that individually we are incapable of personal responsibilities. This eroding of man's faith in himself seems to me to be one of the great dangers of the scientific age because a nation is only the total of its individuals, is only as strong as each individual. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway this afternoon spoke at length and in detail about this very fact and, although I may not always agree with her on solutions, I certainly share her concern, not only for the individuals involved but for the future of Canada when, as she said, so many are living on unproductive forms of maintenance. Due to the unequalled success of one of our Canadian politicians in staying in power for 22 years by the process of following what people seemed to want, we have less and less stability direction and leadership given by governments, but rather a piecemeal line of least resistance and, worst of all, a usurping of responsibilities which should remain with individuals.

The "for motherhood and against sin" tone of the Speech from the Throne is probably to be expected but what I did not expect was the remaining influence of the former minister of finance. One of the most charming and amiable gentlemen ever to sit in this house, he showed in his first budget a great tendency to impractical steps, for example, his idea of strengthening our economy by persuading foreign companies to place 25 per cent of the capital stock of their Canadian subsidiaries on the Canadian markets. The theory was that by buying one quarter of each foreign subsidiary this would give Canadians more control over their general economy. This large amount of capital would only have gone into the coffers of the foreign companies. It would not have changed in any extent the control of our economy and it would have completely exhausted our national reserves in gold and foreign exchange. So unworkable a scheme was fortunately dropped but according to the Speech from the Throne another unworkable scheme is still in existence. In it we have this statement:

You will be asked to approve legislation to establish a Canada Development Corporation.

That is short and quickly said but it arouses more terror than hope in those who have given it any thought. It may be unpopular to mention past political patronage and skulduggery on the part of a government which

[Mrs. Wadds.]

managed to weather an election in spite of it but it is too much to hope that such a government will now take noble steps and noble directions. Let no one be bribed, promised or cajoled into thinking that the Canada Development Corporation would be free from political influence with the government as its largest single shareholder. It seems to me a naïveté that we can ill afford to say that the government will appoint all the directors only at the beginning. I hope Canadians are thinking of the vast difficulties of organizing shareholders to elect directors thereafter and of the great danger of the original government appointees being self-perpetuating.

I hope too that Canadians are wondering why they should be asked to invest in a government controlled corporation which has as one aim new enterprises considered too risky for experienced financiers. It has as another aim the saving of Canadian companies from sale to foreign bidders. I hope that Canadians, who are being asked to look with favour on such an idea, will realize that such a government controlled corporation will thereby be paying the highest possible price. This price will be even greater when integration is considered. There will be many occasions of competing with other buyers who intend to integrate with their existing production. For example, a foreign food company might very well bid high on a Canadian jam company which it planned to integrate with its own food business. The Canada Development Corporation would have to top this bid, and there would not seem to be a very likely alignment between jam and the Polymer Corporation. Even if the jam company is good and makes a profit, the cost of purchase having been forced up initially the Canada Development Corporation would find earnings on its original investment relatively small. Who stands to lose? The Canadian taxpayer whose money goes into the initial purchase. Canadian capital is scarce and we do not want it to dwindle further by reason of the smallest possible earnings on invested capital.

• (5:40 p.m.)

The Polymer Corporation is being used as an example, but would it not be equally fair to young Canadians saving to make good investments to point out other crown corporations? In the 1962-63 estimates I found that the C.B.C. needed \$80 million from the federal government to operate the national broadcasting services. Only three years later, in