

*Government Monetary Policy*

but the hon. member, by posing his question, somewhat anticipated my line of argument. However, it is perfectly all right.

We have been convincing ourselves that the correct approach to our economy is to provide, if I may use the phrase which has been generally used, an economic climate within which business will feel at home, will feel comfortable and secure. It is believed that this is all government has to do; that it should provide this sort of climate, whether it be by tax incentives, tax concessions, accelerated depreciation or lower stumpage rates in connection with the lumber industry, special concessions to the mining industry, royalties and that sort of thing.

All these things have been tried at one time or another. The theory is that this is all we have to do and business will function well, thereby the economy will function well and workers will be employed. But it does not happen that way. It occurs for short periods of time, and these periods of time have been decreasing as the years go by. This means that our business cycle is becoming faster, the slumps, the valleys and heights of business activity have become quicker and quicker in the last 20 or 30 years.

The reason this does not function too well is that business primarily is selfish. Any particular industry is selfish to the extent that it is in business and in operation to make a profit. This is the prime motivating force behind business function. The first and prime requisite of corporations, industries or a group of industries in concert one with the other is to make it a profitable enterprise. This is the first and foremost aim.

Following from that, these business organizations or industries have less concern for the effect of this policy upon communities that may be established in their areas. Let us look at the uranium industry. This was of course a government milk-fed group which believed in socialism for the uranium mining corporations themselves. But apart from that and it is not too correct a comparison to draw—they do not take into account too much the effect upon communities within which they are established, if the effect upon those communities is going to override the profit consideration. They do not take into account too much the impact upon the natural resources. The logging industry is a prime example of this. The policy in the logging industry for years and years and years was the old cut and clear policy: "Let us just mow the trees down one after the other, acre after acre, mile after mile, and let us not worry about posterity and whether there will be any trees left for posterity".

90205-6—143

It took the government intervention to stop this practice. Finally the government stepped in and said, "This cut and clear policy is not good. You will have to log in a certain way in order to promote the growth of trees in this same spot in later years, either by natural regeneration process or by artificial means. You will have to plant trees." The government stepped in to protect the interests of the people because of this cut and clear policy. This is one instance where the future of the people was endangered because of the selfish approach of the business corporate structure. I do not complain too much about them trying to do this; I complain about the type of economic system that pushes them into doing it. This is what I say is wrong.

They do not concern themselves too much with the effect upon the work force. When the welfare of that work force becomes a consideration overriding profits, profits come first. We all know of instance after instance of this type of thing happening. Examples extend right to the point where business says it is sorry, it has to curtail production, it has to lay people off and it has to shut down industry. Businesses say, "But we have to protect our profit picture as much as possible".

This is what I was leading up to when I referred to the last three or four years. These warnings were given time and time again, that it required government intervention, government planning, government regulation, government co-ordination of some sort to protect the welfare and interests of our people. We have to protect our workmen, because it is impossible for them to protect their own interests and those of their families. These are of paramount importance to workmen. We have to protect them against, for example, the C.P.R., the Aluminium Company of Canada, H. R. MacMillan and Bloedel or any other corporate structure.

The workman is not in the same class at all; he is just a cog in the wheel producing a certain commodity. He has no way of protecting his own right to work, his own job. If the economic situation becomes such that corporations decide to close down, it is unfortunate for such an individual. He has no way of protecting himself. The only element in society as we know it today which is capable of protecting such an individual, such a workman, is parliament, and I am using this term as being synonymous with parliamentary action.

Parliament, as we know, is in practice run by government. Only the government can introduce certain types of measures into the house, and so on. Initially, therefore, it falls on the government to adopt economic policies to deal with the shortcomings in our present system, and I think the government should