

Mr. ILSLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this matter is entirely extraneous to the debate.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It is not extraneous. My colleague was talking about the number of bureaucrats in the country, and so on, and I want to get this straight.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman will admit that we are on the second reading of the omnibus bill, which has nothing to do with the civil service.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It has everything to do with it, because the whole question is a matter of controls, and the number of people in the employ of the government has a great deal to do with those controls. The statement made this afternoon should not be permitted to go out in that way, because I have the figures here. The monthly payment is \$26,462,000, which would be at the rate of \$317,544,045 a year. I do not want to take up more time, but I want that statement corrected, as I think is my right.

Hon. COLIN GIBSON (Secretary of State): With respect to the statement just made by the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross), I think I should point out that the figure he has just mentioned represents payment not only to civil servants but to employees of crown companies and commissions, and that the figure mentioned is very much larger than the amount paid to civil servants only.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I am not talking about civil servants; I am talking about the people in the employ of the government of Canada. That is what the people of this country are interested in.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, thus far the debate seems to have been largely devoted to a discussion of free enterprise or free initiative economy as against a system of government controlled or planned economy. As was pointed out earlier by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), hon. members of the C.C.F. have taken the position that when we speak of returning to a free economy, a system of free enterprise, we in the official opposition envisage the sort of laissez-faire economy which prevailed in the nineteenth century, and which undoubtedly had its worst development in the nineteen-thirties.

The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario pointed out this afternoon that we do not mean that kind of economy at all. We do, however, mean the type of economy under which freedom of initiative can be given full play, rather than one under which initiative

would be hampered by excessive government controlling and government planning. The type of unrestricted monopolistic capitalism to which the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. Probe) referred is not the type of free enterprise we have in mind at all. But after what has been said, if hon. members in the C.C.F., for whatever reasons they may have, refuse to believe that we do not mean a laissez-faire capitalism, then of course we cannot force them to believe it. It is rather wasting their own time and the time of the house, however, to state with no better foundation than their own desire to believe it, that we wish to go back to that type of economy.

In my subsequent remarks I shall devote some attention to the type of system we have in mind when we use the expression "free enterprise." At the moment, however, may I refer to the statement made last night by the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe), because I believe that statement typifies completely what, for want of a better term, I would call the bureaucratic frame of mind.

The minister's statement is found at page 1957 of *Hansard*, as follows:

Hon. gentlemen seem to think that, after some six years of controls administered by the government, it is now necessary for various members of the opposition groups to examine each item of control and give their opinion on whether the government is doing the right thing or not

In this sentence the minister, by implication at any rate, indicated that it is not proper or necessary, or even perhaps desirable, for us to examine these measures.

Mr. HOWE: Would the hon. member please finish the sentence? He has used only part of it.

Mr. FULTON: I intend to do so. The minister went on to say:

It seems to me that the government which has had experience over six years in the administration of controls should be capable of deciding the appropriate time to abandon them.

That is the end of that particular quotation. It might seem to the minister that that should be the case; it might seem to the house that that should be so. But the point at issue is that apparently the government does not know the best time or method to remove controls. And, further, whether that is so or not, it is surely the function of the opposition to assist the government in arriving at that decision. That is one of the things for which we have an opposition, one of the reasons we have debate and free discussion in the House of Commons. Unless we are