

where those who remained had a monopoly of the field. That monopoly has existed at various times and in various forms, resulting in exploitation, so that while perhaps simultaneously cut-throat competition and monopoly exploitation are opposite terms, nevertheless one follows from the other.

The hon. member stated also that it was a favourite saying of those who cast aspersions on private enterprise, that a man who risks capital is a parasite. I would go farther than that. According to the modern practice of capitalism, I would say that the man who risks capital is not a parasite but a sucker. I am going to try to illustrate my meaning, and I will do so by means of certain references to events that have taken place more or less recently.

I will give two examples and try to authenticate them by reference to the proper documents. Let me give one from my own province, because that is not so generally known in this part of the world. I will read certain questions and answers from the proceedings of the Saskatchewan legislature of Tuesday, March 18, 1947, to indicate what I mean with reference to risk capital:

Mr. Feeley asked the government the following question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Phelps:

(1) Did the Saskatchewan government invest any money in a briquetting plant at Bienfait? If so, when and how much was so invested?

Answer: Yes. 1918-1924, \$267,500.

(2) What was the total cost of the said plant?

Answer: Under agreement, 25 per cent of the cost was paid by the Saskatchewan government, amounting to \$267,500, 50 per cent of the cost by the federal government, and 25 per cent of the cost by the Manitoba government, bringing the total cost to \$1,070,000.

(3) Was any of the money invested by the Saskatchewan government repaid?

Answer: No.

(4) Was any interest paid by the Saskatchewan government on account of above investment?

Answer: No.

(5) Has the property been sold? If so, when was it sold?

Answer: Yes. April 22, 1927.

(6) To whom was it sold, and how much did the Saskatchewan government receive from proceeds of its sale?

Answer: Charles Gathorne Ashwin for the sum of \$1.

I would say that under such circumstances the man who risks capital is definitely a sucker. Let me give another example. I wish to read from the statement made by the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) on

[Mr. Probe.]

Canadair Limited, delivered on Thursday, March 20, 1947. The minister said, in part, as reported at page 1542 of *Hansard*:

During 1946, the Electric Boat Company, a substantial American corporation, became interested in the Cartierville project. This company, with large financial resources, had examined carefully into Canadian economic conditions, and became convinced that it could wisely and profitably engage some of its liquid capital in Canada. After extensive negotiations, Electric Boat Company acquired substantially all of the stock of Canadair Limited, and has entered into an agreement with the Canadian government, effective as of September 14, 1946, covering the crown facilities, contracts, etc., at Cartierville.

I have quoted there from the statement of the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply wherein, on behalf of the government of Canada, he leased to a United States concern, the Electric Boat Company, a property which cost the federal government approximately \$22 million, the lease to run a maximum of fifteen years. The rental during that period was at the rate of \$200,000 a year. The Electric Boat Company, during the life of the lease, had the option of buying the entire business of this aircraft factory at a price which varied, in the first year, from one-quarter of its capital cost, to one-eighth during the fifteenth year. Along with that, the Canadian government gave contracts to the Electric Boat Company, this United States concern, for \$28,000,000 worth of aircraft for Trans-Canada Air Lines and for the Department of National Defence. The sum of \$2,000,000 was invested in this particular instance by the Electric Boat Company, according to the statement of the Minister of Reconstruction, and the Electric Boat Company is to provide Canadair Limited with \$2,000,000 of working capital.

Here we have an instance of a private corporation, not even a Canadian corporation but one in another country, setting up as a going concern in a factory which now has 7,400 employees on the payroll, at a rate of rental for an equipped factory—one of the most modern in the world, I presume, since it has had a successful record in the production of aircraft in the war—a rate which is one-eighth of what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilesley) told this house repeatedly last year was considered an economic rent for a tenant of national housing.

Why do I bring these matters up in this debate on the question whether or not economic controls should be allowed to lapse? I wish to give the Liberal party every credit for what it did in the war emergency, not because it wished to do so, but because it was forced by circumstances to adopt a form of economic planning which I believe the