

not producing surpluses will no doubt produce them in the near future. Under those circumstances what are we to do?

An hon. MEMBER: War.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Of course. The tremendous competition for world markets in the last forty years has to a great extent resulted in the last two wars. More than anything else, those wars have been wars to get markets. I do not see why we cannot get down to a policy of production for use. All people cannot make a profit. If that were possible I would favour the profit system. But, as I said before, if someone makes a profit, someone else must make a loss; that is an absolute fact. I believe that more than anything else the people of Canada are concerned first with security and, second, with a high standard of living. Can we give those two essentials to them under a private enterprise system?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If we can, why have we not done so?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We have.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Few people in Canada have a high standard of living.

During this debate mention has been made of the grain exchange. Let me say that one can go to the city of Winnipeg and, if he will go to a certain district, where the members of the grain exchange live, he will find the finest houses in Canada. They have done well through the grain exchange, and have attained a very high standard of living. One can go to the city of Toronto and find in that city thousands of beautiful homes. They, too, have a high standard of living. One can go into other places where there are good homes and where people have high standards of living. But one can also go into sections of this city, or go on to many farms throughout the country and find people living in abject poverty, and they will have to continue to live under those conditions as long as we have the so-called private enterprise system.

I like enterprise and I like initiative. I like private enterprise as long as it is private enterprise, but the people of Canada will not be fooled much longer by being told that we have private enterprise. We have not private enterprise except in a few cases. There is one thing I have been watching for in this house but as yet I have not seen it. Before very long, possibly during this debate, I hope to hear something said about the abuses of capitalism and the abuses of the free enter-

prise system. No one in this house, outside this group and the little group to my left—I do not agree with them but they have ideas—has any idea as to what is to be done about the abuses of capitalism or the abuses of the private enterprise system. No one has any idea as to how private enterprise is to be made to work. I hope that before this debate is over or before I have finished serving my constituents in this parliament somebody will rise in his place and tell me and this group just how this can be done.

Are we to continue under this so-called private enterprise system? I call it "so-called" because it is not a private enterprise system. Our industries in Canada have largely reached the point where they are controlled by a small group of people. We have not private enterprise in Canada; what we have is monopoly enterprise. This small group of people who are directors in banks, insurance companies and industries of all kinds control the whole economic life of this country. When people think parliament is running this country they are just fooling themselves. I have no illusions as to that.

We in the C.C.F. talk about a planned economy. We say that we must plan our economy to produce such wealth as it is possible to produce and distribute that wealth to the people in the form of wages and costs of all kinds. We have had a planned economy in this country; the small group I have mentioned have planned our economy for their own benefit and the people of the country have suffered as a result. If we allow this small group of people to control this country we are condemning our youth as well as the present generation to the same kind of conditions that existed during the thirties.

I am going to vote against the subamendment and I am going to vote against the amendment. Why? Each of these amendments simply says that the government have failed here or failed there or somewhere else. Perhaps they have. I feel quite sure that they will fail, and they will fail because they will not do the things that must be done to make a success of the things that they want to do.

I wish to say something now in their favour. We have heard a good deal of criticism in connection with bringing home the boys from overseas. I do not claim to know enough about how to get these boys back and give them a fair deal to say whether the government have failed or not. I do not want to brag about my boys, but three of them are in the active forces—two in the air force and one in the army—and one came home from