

*The Address—Mr. Low*

or try to interpret the Conservative declaration or what it means. I think perhaps the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew), this afternoon just before the dinner hour, made at least some parts of it extremely clear. But we Social Crediters are sincere and very firm in our belief that the welfare of Canada is dependent upon private or individual enterprise: that is, the right of every individual, by himself or in association or co-operation with others, to engage in any enterprise or pursuit of his choice that has not been expressly forbidden by law on the ground that it violates fundamental human rights, or some of them.

In my judgment history is full of evidence that an economic system based upon private enterprise, in its capacity to produce goods and services, is infinitely superior to one that is based upon socialism, given equal natural resources, climate and other conditions upon which production depends. In that respect I am in thorough agreement with my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition. The reason for that is, of course, the greater inducements that are to be found in a private enterprise system; that is, inducements to all-out productive effort. The profit motive that is a part of the private enterprise system is a powerful motive to effort. It is one that appeals powerfully to basic human nature. No other motive has ever been discovered that will urge human beings to do things and to produce things with anything like the energy, the drive and the initiative with which they do them under a private enterprise system. Let it not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that an abundance of goods and services must be produced if the people in any economy—I do not care what you call it—are to be able to live abundantly.

Private enterprise has solved the problem of production. It has not been socialism that has done that. Private enterprise has built our country into the great, powerful and wonderful country that it is today. Socialism, in my judgment, never could have done it under any circumstances.

It is perfectly true that neither private enterprise nor socialism has as yet solved the problem of distribution. It is also true that maldistribution is the disease that plagues every economy in the world, free or not free. No economy has as yet learned how to distribute equitably the abundance that it is capable of producing in peacetime, or how to prevent unemployment or how to prevent or cure the cycles of boom and bust that occur all too frequently in our economies. But I have faith that we can solve the problem of distribution, and I have faith that we can do it without having to

[Mr. Low.]

sacrifice or to destroy the private enterprise system with all its basic natural advantages, or without plunging the country into war or dictatorship of any kind.

We should be spending our energies in a united effort to perfect the very imperfect mechanisms of distribution, the most important one of which, of course, is the money mechanism. As you know, Mr. Speaker, high finance, which is perhaps the most anti-social, anti-human-welfare monopoly in the world, has never feared socialism and it does not fear it today. One newspaper correspondent not so long ago wrote that the money monopoly would crawl into bed with Coldwell, but would never crawl into bed with Low for fear of getting hurt. That was just his way of saying that high finance does not worry about socialism, because every socialist effort ever yet made let finance carry on in its control of all things without any fundamental change whatsoever. They know that under Social Credit, of course, they would lose their unlimited power over the lives and the property of the people and would have to yield that power back to the people themselves.

From the way private enterprise operates today I know that it is not perfect. Abuses have crept in. Abuses are there. We know there has to be, for the sake of the safety, welfare and liberties of the people, some government regulation. But we believe that regulation should be limited to what is necessary to safeguard the safety, welfare and liberties of Canadian citizens. We stand unshaken in our determination to preserve and to perfect the private enterprise system as the real base of our Canadian economy.

My friend the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch), when he spoke in this house on November 24, spoke with conviction. I congratulate him on being honest enough to say, without qualification, that the C.C.F. group are socialists. That is their right. I concede to every man the right to choose what he will be. I am sure that statement indicates the respect that I hold for their views and for their approach to the problems that we face. But I am perfectly sure that anyone would find it extremely difficult to discover today exactly what is the official Canadian definition of socialism. I have read many books and pamphlets that purported to tell what socialism is, from the time that Fred Henderson wrote that socialism is government ownership of the means of production and distribution—all of them—down to my friend the hon. member for Vancouver East who, the other night, seemed to imply that socialism is co-operation. I think it would be worth while if we could be given