

Supply—Mines and Technical Surveys

and welfare, so to speak, so far as the mining industry is concerned and that the minister is, shall I say, the apex or the Santa Claus of the mining industry. This department represents very clearly free enterprise supported by public funds.

Mr. Comtois: I wish to tell the hon. member that I am awake.

Mr. Herridge: The minister refers to an incident earlier this session when I accused him of sleeping in the house. I apologize most sincerely. I did not realize that he was enjoying contemplation because he appeared to be completely inert.

I must bring to the attention of the committee the fact that this is a demonstration of, shall I say, the insincerities of the system under which we live and which is always preaching free enterprise. Here we find free enterprise bolstered to the hilt with public funds, and we are not opposing them under certain circumstances. However, I cannot resist bringing to the minister's attention that he is actually administering a form of socialist enterprise in some sections of the mining industry.

I now want to refer to the question of renewable natural resources or non-renewable natural resources and ask a few questions. An extremely interesting document came to my hand recently. It is entitled "Canada, A Nation of Economic Liars" by C. M. Campbell, mining engineer, Vancouver, B.C. I have read it with great interest. I am going to quote two paragraphs and then ask the minister a few questions because I think there is some truth in these paragraphs, particularly when one reads the history of the mining industry and the sort of buoyant statements made at the beginning of this century with respect to our resources of ore, coal and things of that sort and the actual situation that developed in certain areas. We now have ghost towns in British Columbia and other provinces where at one time we were told there was going to be unending prosperity. I read from page 14 of this booklet: under the heading "Is British Columbia against the Coyne Report?":

The immediate reaction in B.C. is against the Coyne report. One university of British Columbia economist says, "B.C. should back primary industry." Another says, "Primary industry could be Canada's salvation." Then why, after a century of primary industry, are we not saved?

I think that is a very pertinent remark.

A third says: "There has never been a country in the world that was not developed by an older country." As far as this province and Canada are concerned it has been a case mainly of depletion by the U.S., and not development at all, and it has been done with our co-operation which, apparently will continue. We are, also, no younger than the three Pacific states to the south, in aggregate area smaller than this province,—

[Mr. Herridge.]

That is British Columbia.

—yet, based on primary and secondary industry, largely on their own initiative, they have a population, higher paid and more prosperous than ours, ten times as large as ours and as large as that of all Canada.

In the editorial column of a daily paper the statement is made that efforts to change the tide are "reminiscent of King Canute's futile gesture." "U.S. investment," we are also told, "has been the spark plug of our post-war prosperity... These are circumstances to which we have adapted ourselves and we should at times kneel in thanksgiving that they have been such pleasant circumstances." For any nation to be thankful when its prosperity is based on the depletion of its talents with no replacement, is hard to understand.

Needless to say we are appalled at this justification of the sell-out. That our students, 10,000 at the university alone, and our young men should become indoctrinated with these ideas is hard to believe. This dominion was founded as a member of the British empire, with a vision of a great future in it or its changing forms. Instead, as the preceding indicates, we seem content with the menial position of a Gibeonite in the American entourage.

I think there is some truth in the writer's analysis of the situation, although I think in some spots it is an exaggeration. However, he goes on to deal with these natural resources and at page 15 has this to say about the need for a realistic inventory of our mineral resources:

As far as minerals are concerned, and they are the basis of our modern civilization, it is imperative that we know just what we have and what are the probabilities and possibilities for more. But, before any tabulation is made, we must have a code of rules agreed to by the universities, the mining institute, professional engineers, and the government mining departments and—it must be followed. In this we are 50 years behind. It is essential that the atrocities that have brought disaster be eliminated. This will be a difficult task for trafficking in plausible lies is all about us.

In that connection he is referring to the mining industry. As far as the forest industry is concerned, the government of Canada in co-operation with the provincial government has undertaken a survey or an inventory of the forest resources of Canada. This survey has proved to be of great value and has provided information upon which can be based a logical and long term development of that industry. As far as I understand it, nothing has been attempted in that direction with respect to our mineral resources. I am one of those who believe something should be attempted in that direction. We are leaving it entirely to the big corporations, who in many cases get a monopoly of the ore in certain industries. They divide the country up among themselves and as far as governments and the people are concerned there is no, shall I say, elementary knowledge even as to our total resources of minerals and the period for which we may expect them to exist. We are always being told of the limitless resources in this and that field, and so on.