

The Budget—Mr. Hansell

Mr. Hansell: It is a nice thing to know that my friends are not through yet; but I have listened to them for a good many years and I have not heard them suggest any change in fundamental policy. What they are doing may be illustrated in this way. The Liberal party is in an automobile. There is something wrong with the carburetor and something wrong with the fundamental principle of the combustion engine.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hansell: My Conservative friends say, "If you will only let us get in the driver's seat we will be able to make that old jalopy go much better than you can. The trouble with you is you have too many bolts on the bumper at the back and not enough bolts on the bumper at the front". They would change the bumpers around and put more bolts in here and more nuts in there.

An hon. Member: You have a monopoly on the nuts.

Mr. Hansell: I call my Conservative friends the bolts and nuts boys. What we need is a different fundamental policy. We are trying to ride in the old jalopy when we are now in a new age with a different type of combustion engine altogether. What we Social Crediters claim is that present financial policy cannot possibly meet the needs of this advanced age. I want to say a word to my socialist friends.

An hon. Member: They want to take the wheels off the car.

Mr. Hansell: They are not concerned with such changes. They are concerned with who owns the car. That is their trouble, but I do not like to say too much about them. They are having their troubles, and I do not want to put myself in the position of kicking a man who is down. I am afraid I will have to be a little more gracious to them. My friends have simply gone all to pieces lately, and I like to be as kind and considerate to them as I can.

Of course the reason they have gone to pieces is that they have been trying to ride two horses at the same time. They have been advocating nationalization when in reality they have at the same time been supporting a good deal of free enterprise. They talk nationalization, yet some of them own their own farms and businesses. When you talk of nationalizing their farms and businesses they turn thumbs down on that. In fact we listened to a speech this afternoon by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue). I cannot quote from his speech because it was in another debate, but what did he do? He

made a speech on the necessity of the farmers of Canada being free to choose—

Mr. Ellis: C.C.F. policy.

Mr. Hansell:—where to deliver their grain. My C.C.F. friends talk continually of a planned economy, but when the government attempts to plan the routing of cars in an emergency they say, oh no, you must not do that. You must not plan, you must give the farmers an absolutely free hand. It does not make sense. All I am saying is that you cannot ride two horses at the same time. If it is to be a planned economy then let them go the limit and have a planned economy.

I hope the day never comes when we have a socialist planned economy in this country. I have asked them before and I ask them again, who is going to do the planning? They are not going to be satisfied to let us do the planning. They are not going to be satisfied to let the government do the planning. They are the ones who want to do the planning, so when they talk of a planned economy you can put it down, and make no mistake about it, that they believe in a socialist planned economy. A socialist planned economy means that the freedom of the people is thrown to the winds. You cannot have a planned economy if the people rise up and say "We do not want to fit into the plan". What is going to happen then? A planned economy means the loss of freedom.

I do not like to say I had a dream the other night, but I am mighty glad it was a dream. I woke up with a nightmare. I saw my C.C.F. friends sitting on the government benches.

An hon. Member: That will be the day.

Mr. Ellis: A vision of the future.

An hon. Member: That certainly was a dream.

Mr. Hansell: It was worse than a dream; it was a nightmare. They had their own boys sitting there and they had changed the names of the portfolios somewhat. Here was Hon. Mr. Coldwell sitting there as prime minister. Beside him was Hon. Mr. MacInnis who was labelled as minister of the public purse and taxation. Beside him was Hon. Mr. Cameron, controller of defence production. Here was Hon. Mr. Stewart, minister of foreign affairs, world government and demobilization of NATO. Then there was Hon. Mr. Nicholson, minister of justice, Hon. Mr. Regier, minister of provincial relations, Hon. Mr. Knight, minister of propaganda and cultural stimuli, and Hon. Mr. Noseworthy was minister of labour. Then Hon. Mr. Knowles—this was the nightmare—was secretary of state for war. Hon. Mr. Herridge