

government, the business of the country, to see that food goes where it is needed and not where there is the largest purse. It is quite true that the large purse can still even today get a larger share, but with the controls that are provided there is a better and more equitable distribution of the national income in Great Britain today than ever before, with the possible exception of the war period.

I would suggest to the house, to the opposition as well as to the government, that if we are to avoid what this country went through between 1930 and 1939 we shall not avoid it by a return to a free economy. We can avoid it only by learning the lessons of those terrible years and applying them in an orderly and democratic fashion.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): During the resolution stage of this measure I listened to a number of members rivalling each other in an attempt to attach this or that name to this bill. I was reminded of the fact that a rose by any other name would smell just as sweet, and therefore I think that in dealing with this measure one must deal with it entirely on its merits. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in what names certain people may attach to it.

Some hon. members have blamed the government for conditions being such that it is necessary to continue certain measures of control today. The important point to keep in mind is that we have to face the facts as they are. We have to face conditions as they are today. It is not a question that conditions should be better or that certain action should have been taken to make conditions different. The point is that certain conditions exist today requiring the continuation of certain measures.

I would agree with some of the criticism made by some hon. members, that these conditions should have been different by now. Some of that criticism was justified. Nevertheless we have to face the conditions as they are and not as they should or might have been. Therefore, if the minister can prove to our satisfaction in the committee stage that all these measures are necessary I shall have no hesitation in supporting the bill.

The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) suggested that we in this group are opposed to all controls. At no time has this group taken the stand that we are opposed to all controls; but we are not in favour of controls for the sake of controls, and the speech delivered by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), and quoted by the hon. member for Vancouver East, certainly did not indicate

opposition to all controls. The hon. member for Peace River was criticizing certain controls that were being maintained.

We realize that unless you curb the abuse of capitalism you will have jungle law, the survival of the fittest, the dog-eat-dog system, and we are not for one minute advocating that we go back to that type of system in this country. The alternatives that face us today are capitalism controlled in the interests of the people—and we in this group believe that the social credit system is the way in which capitalism may be controlled—and communism on the other hand. In the final analysis, we do not believe that there is any alternative to these two things because the people will never again agree to return to the laissez-faire form of capitalism. That might have been regarded as the alternative years ago, but that day has gone by.

When the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine) spoke on the resolution stage he chided the farmers of western Canada for directing their wrath against the former Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) rather than against certain corporations. Speaking as a farmer, I think the hon. member for Cariboo entirely missed the grounds upon which the farmers are complaining. It is the result of the culmination of a number of things that have happened of recent years, and it is necessary to go back to the thirties to see why the farmers are feeling so critical of the government's policy today.

In the thirties agricultural prices fell to a very low level. At that time we did not hear any propaganda by consumers that prices of products should be increased so as to give the farmers a fair return. The consumers were apparently quite glad to be able to buy goods at very low prices, even though it might mean the bankruptcy of agriculture, and whenever agriculture demanded higher prices they were told that the government could do nothing about the matter because this was an international situation. They were told that they would have to be willing to accept world market prices, and while it is true that from 1935 to 1939 certain modified controls were put into force, they were not effective in dealing with that situation.

After a few years of war, prices rose and then ceilings were placed upon prices to prevent the farmer from getting the full benefit of world market prices. Unfortunately, during the time that farmers had been obliged to produce at low prices, they had been forced heavily into debt, and the only way they could possibly pay their debts was by receiving for