

*Natural Resources—Development*

My colleagues in this group and I feel that certainly this parliament should do everything possible, along with private industry, to develop this country in every possible respect, but in doing so the public interest must be given first position. We must at all times be conscious of the fact that our resources, our industry and our whole capital structure are here for the people, and not the reverse. The people are not here to serve the economic system; the economic system is here to serve the people, and it is our duty as representatives of the people to find ways and means in which it can serve the public interest in the most efficient and fairest manner. The attitude of our party is set out very clearly in a statement which was issued approximately a month ago by the national council of the C.C.F. I would like to put it on the record. It consists of only one paragraph and I think it is worth while. We state:

The C.C.F. believes that the people themselves, through their democratically elected governments, should have the final voice in determining the nature and direction of our economic development. This means that our governments—both federal and provincial—must play a much more active part in the nation's economic life than is permitted under the old-fashioned laissez-faire philosophy of the Liberal, Progressive Conservative and Social Credit parties.

Now, let us relate that to the motion before the house. After having analysed carefully the proposal in the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition and then trying to discover by reading his speech and the speeches of those in his group who spoke after him how they would go about bringing that into effect, I must admit that I found it very frustrating. It was somewhat like trying to find a black cat in a dark room, particularly when the cat was not there.

Once again it seems to me the Leader of the Opposition has carefully hung his clothes on a hickory limb and has refused to go into the water. He has placed before this house the proposition that we should adopt a national development policy, and then has failed to tell us what his party would do to bring about such a policy. The closest he came to it was when he used the words which have already been quoted by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, where he said, as reported at page 1155 of *Hansard*:

We do not want a day-to-day course wherein there are great developments in Canada depending on the world situation, but a plan; not a planned economy but a national policy.

Well, now, that is really a mouthful of words, but that is how it is. He wants a plan; he wants a national policy with a plan. The words themselves I do not think were thrown in casually. Taking into

[Mr. Zaplitny.]

account the responsibility that is carried by the Leader of the Opposition as a potential or possible next prime minister of this country, I think the words must have been weighed very deliberately. I took careful note of them the second or third time I read them and wondered why he related great developments to the world situation. I just wonder whether he did not have in the back of his mind when he used those words, "great developments in Canada depending on the world situation" the experience of the economy of this country as it developed following the second world war.

This is exactly the point at which my colleagues and I have been driving for many years. We have been pointing out that our economy, unfortunately, seems to expand and boom only as a result of some international conflict or threatened conflict.

In the 10-year period from 1930 to 1940, when Canada and the rest of the world were relatively at peace, we had the same resources in this country that we have now; and though our population was smaller it was certainly as intelligent, capable and energetic as it is today, yet this country stagnated. We were told by one federal government after another—and here I distribute favours equally, because we had both a Liberal and a Conservative government during that period—that we could not do this or that simply because there was no money.

Despite the fact that members of the C.C.F. group tried again and again to prove to the government of the day and to the people that after all money was production, and as long as people were capable of applying themselves to the resources of our nation that in itself was the creation of money and not the paper it was printed on, it took a war with its attendant suffering, bloodshed and destruction to wake up the government of the day and make them realize that it is possible to use our own energies, resources and ingenuity to develop our own nation. Now we find ourselves faced with many of the same problems.

What are some of the things the Leader of the Opposition complains of and wants action upon? I have divided his motion into five parts for convenience. He may have arranged the points in a different order, but here are the five parts I took out of it. In the first place he wants greater development of our natural resources. Second, he wishes something done to encourage greater processing, that is more secondary industries, rather than letting our raw materials go elsewhere for processing. Third, he wants something done to correct our unfavourable