

month, but immediately. This was last May—ten months ago. Some of them promised a million new homes in ten years.

Do you remember those advertisements, Mr. Speaker? I am sure you do. You probably used some of them yourself. Do you remember the beautiful advertisement portraying a house which would appear to be worth at least \$8,000, and alongside which appeared the caption: "What! You're buying that lovely little home for only \$13.82 a month?" I have a copy of this advertisement in my hand, and I should be pleased to show it to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and to the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) so that they may refresh their failing memories. Here is what this Liberal election advertisement says:

We are planning for at least 600,000 housing units, and perhaps 1,000,000. No matter where you live, you will be able to reside in a comfortable home of which you can be proud.

The Liberal government believes that it is the right of every family to own its own home—and live in it. The new housing plan is one of many brought about by the Liberals to provide the people with genuine social security now.

That was last May. This copy advocates the election of the distinguished hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Sinclair). I wonder what the people of Oshawa think of it to-day. I wonder how many are buying homes at \$13.82 a month. I wonder how many veterans are getting suitable homes at all.

The housing situation is a festering sore on the body politic, an inexcusable blot on Canada's war effort. Could it have been avoided? Certainly it could have been. When one assesses the causes of the situation, he realizes that this government during ten years of office could have avoided the trouble.

What were the causes? They were lack of planning in advance; lack of coordination of government agencies involved; divided authority; divided responsibility; failure to tie in with provincial and municipal authorities; government frustration of private builders; the monopolizing of building materials; rigid controls holding up production of necessary fixtures. In addition there was the usual story of laws against production impeding recovery.

I have no words in my vocabulary adequate to condemn the lack of unified and aggressive action in this matter. A national emergency exists. During the war we met the national emergency courageously and forthrightly. Surely we shall not be less resolute in peace.

I now come to a discussion of agriculture and food. The speech from the throne tells us that the most pressing problem demanding immediate attention is the food problem. That is a fact we have known for months—

that is, everybody except the government. We heard about their new policy first in the speech from the throne. Then instead of taking the advice that he gave to the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) to go to church on Saint Patrick's day, the Prime Minister comes out on that day with a new programme on agriculture.

It is only a few weeks since the government held an agricultural objectives conference with the provincial governments on the subject of the agricultural programme for the coming year. At that conference there was no substantial change made from the programme of last year, yet since last year the world picture for food has changed very greatly for the worse.

Every one will recognize that a nation of 12,000,000 people cannot be expected to prevent starvation all over the world, but no one expects it to. We are only expected to do what we can. Famine can be offset only by food, and food can be saved by those who have it and increased by those who grow it. Canada should be helping in both directions. Our criticism of the government in this respect is that it has made no major effort to revise its last year's plans to meet the more pressing demands of this year. We have heard nothing since we last met of an organized plan to save more food until, as I said, we had this announcement in the speech from the throne and then the present announcement made yesterday by the Prime Minister.

The stubborn attitude of the government in connection with the food prices is in sharp contrast with the action of other important food producing nations. Only three weeks ago the United States government made important upward revisions in its food objectives for 1946. They have raised its goals for wheat, corn and soy beans by at least one million acres each. Increased seedings of other crops are also called for. Australia has requested her farmers to bring her wheat acreage back to pre-war levels by seeding four million acres more this year. Except for the belated statement of the Prime Minister issued on Sunday we have heard nothing since we last met of an organized plan to save more food. We have heard nothing of any plan to increase the production of food.

In his long prepared statement on the food crisis the Prime Minister spent more than half his time extolling the productive efforts of the farmers of Canada during the last four years. I join with him in that, because they did a good job. It is all very well to talk of the past, but what we want now and in the immediate future is more food. The government admits that the food crisis will last for from