

for employment, and should not be held responsible for it. I shall deal at greater length with that point in a few minutes.

Again, our socialist friends say that private enterprise has failed, because it has not effected a distribution of the national wealth and the products of industry. Again I say that is a false charge, because private enterprise is not responsible for distribution and cannot be held responsible for it. Therefore I say that is false charge No. 2.

Again, our C.C.F. friends assert that private enterprise has failed, because it refuses to develop natural resources. Well, certainly if conditions in the pre-war years are indicative of what can be done under a system of private enterprise then no one with reason can assert that there was no development of our natural resources. The country was flooded with goods; everyone was complaining about over-production; the warehouses and storehouses of our country, from one end to the other, were stocked with goods. Plant equipment was running at half capacity, and even less. Surely there was no indication at that time of a refusal to develop resources. I say that, too, is a false charge.

The socialists claim that private enterprise refuses to plan. Again I say that is a false charge, for observation must indicate to anyone that the method of producing goods on this continent, including Canada and the United States, is equal to and perhaps in many respects is superior to the method of production anywhere else in the world.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that all these charges against private enterprise are false. I consider that one of the strongest reasons that can be advanced as to why the principle of private enterprise is sound lies in the fact that every citizen in this country wishes to exercise that principle for himself. That includes even our friends of the C.C.F. They, themselves, privately and personally, are private enterprisers. They own their own farms and they own their own businesses; they are private enterprisers at heart.

The greatest argument in favour of private enterprise is the fact that each and every one of us privately and personally, in his heart of hearts, is a private enterpriser. We desire the principle of ownership for ourselves; we desire to own our own property, our own business and our own affairs, in our own way, without any interference from the state.

As I have said on previous occasions to my hon. friends in the C.C.F., I consider that aspect of their policy the one deserving of greatest condemnation. As I have said several times before, they follow the policy of making

fish of one and fowl of another. On the one hand they condemn profit and the profit motive, private enterprise and private ownership; and yet, so far as their policy is concerned, on the other hand they propose to leave part of the community operating under private enterprise and propose to nationalize or socialize another section of it.

As I have said previously, consistency is the test of any policy. If the profit motive is wrong in principle, if the making of profits is a wrong procedure, then surely it must be wrong for everyone in the community. How can they be right for some merchants, just because they happen to be small businessmen, and wrong for others? I say that glaring inconsistency should arouse the suspicions of the people.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Does the hon. member's party say that everything should be privately owned? Is that his argument?

Mr. KUHL: Personally I would not see any harm in that being so.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Everything?

Mr. KUHL: I do not think ownership of production of anything has anything to do with the distribution of the product. I am not saying, for instance, that if the Social Credit party were charged with the responsibility of forming an administration it would turn the Canadian National Railways over to private ownership. I am not saying that, at all.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: To be consistent, the hon. member would have to say that.

Mr. KUHL: Well, I personally would be prepared to do it, perhaps.

Mr. BRYCE: Would the hon. member be prepared to hand over the post office?

Mr. KUHL: Of course we would get into an argument as to what constitutes a public utility. In that particular, one could draw a line anywhere he wished, as he wished to define it. My hon. friends want to go a good deal farther than the post office. They would want to go right down into the production of boots and shoes, and things of that kind.

Mr. HANSELL: They want money enough to ride on the railways.

Mr. KUHL: So far as nationalization is concerned, what difference does it make whether or not the government owns a business? The Canadian National Railways are publicly owned; but one cannot ride on those railways free of charge, any more than he can on the Canadian Pacific. Nor can one