

"The prohibition of monopoly and maintenance of compulsory competition." Here is a significant statement:

A Standard Oil company, however, may be unscrambled into its separate constituents, but it is open to question whether these can be compelled effectively to compete.

We know very well that no monopoly or combine, if unscrambled by law, can be made to compete against itself under the free enterprise system. The thing does not make sense. We have another bit of evidence on that from the committee on farm implements in 1937. In their report to the house they said:

The lack of free price competition in this industry, as in many other industries is one of the real problems in modern economic life.

Then they go on to say:

From the standpoint of the business executives, price competition was not a satisfactory condition, and escape from it was one of the salient reasons for the formation of large corporate units by the amalgamation of smaller previously existing companies.

That tells us in plain language that you cannot make a monopoly turn into a free enterprise institution. You may unscramble it by law but you cannot make it compete. The process will start all over again, amalgamation will take place, and price competition will be squeezed out. It is only natural that it should be so, because under the capitalist system, those who are in business, those who are trying to make as big a profit as possible, try every trick of the trade known to them, and one of those tricks is to do away with your competitor. It is the natural process of capitalism. It is no use denying it because it is there, and there is no law on the statute books effective enough to make monopoly competitive business. It will not work. The only way in which monopolies can be effectively handled is to place them under public ownership, so that any surplus or profit that may be made will go to the benefit of the people of the country. As a matter of fact, we have already done that to some extent in this country.

An hon. MEMBER: Do you make any profits in Saskatchewan?

An hon. MEMBER: Saskatchewan is doing very well.

An hon. MEMBER: How is the boot factory doing?

An hon. MEMBER: What is the price of bricks?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Have you enough boxes to put them in?

[Mr. Zaplitny.]

Mr. BENTLEY: Yes, and we can even bury a few Liberals in the boxes that are left over.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that what I have to say has started a lively debate in this house, because these are problems which have to be debated. However, time is passing. I think we all need to realize in this house, what the newspapers and public opinion across the country have made quite clear to all hon. members, that the people want action now. They are not particularly concerned as to how the government will approach the problem in the future. They want something done today.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What do you charge for lumber manufactured under public ownership in Saskatchewan? What do you charge per thousand?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I do not charge anything for lumber. In the first place, I do not live in Saskatchewan. The hon. member for Fraser Valley may think I come from Saskatchewan, and perhaps that is why he asked the question. I do not come from that province but from a province close to Saskatchewan. I am not going to attempt to answer the question because it has nothing to do with what I am saying.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Don't you know what your party does?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Yes, but you do not know what yours does. The members of the Liberal party have been doing a good deal of interrupting in the last few hours, and I might offer them a little advice in a friendly way if they wish to take it, namely, that they heed the warning issued them by their own electors. I know that the people of western Canada, and certainly the people of Manitoba, the farmers and labourers who are the backbone of that province, have expressed themselves in no uncertain terms for price control now, and if the private members of the Liberal party want to do both themselves and the government a favour, and to render a public service to the people they represent, instead of interrupting and trying to belittle and ridicule the efforts of this group, they should be in with us pitching to make the government act instead of setting up a committee.

Mrs. GLADYS STRUM (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet spoken in this debate. I made one speech in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, because I thought there was no other problem in Canada quite so pressing as the problem of