

back to those conditions. We admit the evil of those conditions; but that is being used as a convenient thing to throw at us, and therefore I am going to make just two comments about it. I am going to remind people of two things, first of all that we were not responsible for those conditions. I am not going to suggest who was responsible. Perhaps it would not be unfair to say that in the gay twenties governments were inclined to believe that booms could go on forever, just as private individuals did.

I am not going to say anything more about that except that I think during those years the leader of this party, Lord Bennett, who was in power then, tried courageously to meet difficult and unprecedented conditions and did devise schemes which, though perhaps not perfect, in the years succeeding were in effect followed, with adaptations if you will, and that he did break the ground with courage and energy in trying to deal with a situation which had never been foreseen and which was extremely difficult. While commenting on that point I should like to say that when people say we want to go back to the conditions of the thirties, that is a very unfair thing because we accept, as everyone accepts, the fact that there have been great changes since that time.

What have been the changes since then? I shall mention two or three. In the first place we have grown to accept a measure of social security and social services that was not accepted then. Second, we have grown to accept the measure of taxation which is necessary to maintain those social services. Third, I would point out—and I go back to what I said about freedom—that freedom is never absolute. The other day our own party went on record in favour of certain floor prices. We recognize that in the thirties the farmers were left exposed to the full force of the blizzard while other people were able to get some shelter, at any rate. Therefore, as I say, when anyone suggests that we are prepared to go back to the conditions of the thirties, in my opinion that is a very unfair statement and one which should not be made.

Mr. KNOWLES: We claim that would be the effect.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I doubt if everyone to my left is quite as careful as my hon. friend in the statements he makes, or rather in the statement he makes now.

Then I should like to turn to this question of planning, because I think I can understand why planning is attractive. But let us bear in mind that it is planning for other people that is attractive, that there is not so much

attraction in having other people plan for us. I think it very important to remember that. Last evening I believe the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) had that in mind when he made what I think was a very wise statement in regard to planning. At page 1946 of *Hansard* he said:

We all object to interference with our freedom. I do; indeed, if there is anyone who likes to have his own way more than I do, I should like to meet him.

I thought that was a very sound observation on the part of the hon. gentleman. I was reminded of the story with which no doubt all hon. members are familiar, of the Irishman who was having the judgment day expounded to him. After it had been explained he asked, "Well, will the Murphys be there?" He was told, "Yes, they will be there." He asked, "Will the O'Flahertys be there?" He was told, "Yes, they will be there." "Will all the Finnigans be there?" "Yes, they will be there." Then he said, "Well, I'm thinkin' there'll be mighty little judging done the first day." I thought that might be said in regard to planning and regulating the hon. gentleman, who today is absent.

I said I wanted to see if there was not some area of agreement, to see if these parallel lines could come together at all, because when we are talking about these matters which go to the very root of our economic welfare in the future I think it desirable that we should try, as far as we can, to talk the same language. I suggest that there is an area of agreement. I suggest, for example, that we will all agree and are all agreed that the tremendously important thing now is production. That is becoming a terribly commonplace expression, but let us remember that it was not always commonplace. Let us remember that we were suffering, or thought we were suffering years ago, from over-production. In that connection I want to read a sentence or two from the British white paper, because it is interesting I think, to have the case as set out by Mr. Attlee to the British people, and it is interesting to read the remarks he made which I think *mutatis mutandis* apply to us here. At the end of this long paper he has this to say:

Apart from these special dangers—

Which he has outlined.

—the great difference between our economic conditions today and those between the wars is that, for as far ahead as we can see, there will be a high demand for the products of industry. It would appear that there is no danger for many years to come that industry as a whole will have to work below capacity because of a falling off in the general demand for its products.