

while the house is on fire.

What is needed today is action, not words, clear-cut decisions and not vague and tottering propositions. We need men who can foresee circumstances instead of being their victims; able leaders who know where they are going and where they are leading the people. We need also a sound, clear-cut policy conceived for the sole welfare of our country. The Canadian people is much more interested in knowing what the future holds in store than to know who will be the next leader of the Liberal party.

The government is responsible for the difficult situation against which the people are now struggling and should find means of remedying it. The government has the power and indeed the imperious duty of fulfilling the promises they made to the electors of Canada, and guaranteeing our citizens freedom from want and unemployment, by providing for their security through the re-establishment of our economic structure on a solid basis.

The state's responsibilities regarding security may be compared to that of the educator towards the child; each must point the way, while giving full play to individual initiative. The state must see that human goods are fairly distributed, so that society may function smoothly, yet should not distribute those goods directly since it cannot do so without controlling the individual and disrupting the normal functioning of social life. On the other hand, when the state fulfils its responsibilities intelligently and firmly, the social problem easily solves itself, writes Mr. Esdras Minville, director of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales de Montreal.

The failure of the short-sighted policy of the present administration has destroyed the confidence which the electors had placed in our politicians who, after dragging us into the war in 1939, promised peace and heaven on earth to the people in 1945. They now ask the people to tighten their belts, make sacrifices and refrain from eating fruits and vegetables, and from buying cabbages at 16 cents a pound and lettuce at 75 cents a head, in order to conserve American dollars, after having foolishly spent one billion dollars for Britain. As was pointed out by the seconder of the motion (Mr. Dickey) whom I should like to congratulate on his first speech in parliament.

Canadians had reason to hope that exchange restrictions were a thing of the past. Excise taxes and restriction of imports to limit consumption were very far from our minds.

Last September the minister of finance (Mr. Abbott) stated that we were able to help Great Britain because of our imports from the United

States. In order to further the economic re-establishment of European countries, Canada has had to make large scale purchases in the United States, but digging into its supply of American dollars has only led the country to dependency and to the humiliating results now being felt. Our neighbours to the south hold our national economy in tow. Unfortunately, we receive political and economic guidance or direction either from Great Britain or the United States.

Mr. Abbott added:

A substantial part of Canada's exports must always be paid for in cash or convertible exchange, otherwise we would not continue to pay for the U.S. imports on which our economy depends.

According to Mr. Minville:

Canada's highest interests, our normal development towards freedom, require a policy stressing appropriate diversification and the expansion of foreign markets.

We should trade with all countries which are prepared to trade with us as free countries dealing with another of the same status, in a spirit of world co-operation, diversify our markets so as to balance their fluctuations one against the other, stabilize the situation as a whole and avoid becoming too dependent on any one country.

The price we have paid as a result of our sentimental and economic attachment for Great Britain should be high enough to open the government's eyes.

While lending support to the establishment of international societies capable of preserving us from the scourge of war, let us build in this country such institutions as may ward off the repetition of depressions of the kind we have known in the past. Capitalism as it operates today under government sponsorship is gradually paving the way to socialism and its train of disaster.

If for instance the federal government were to reduce operating expenses to a minimum and eliminate useless outlays, the Post Office Department could most certainly give my constituents the services they claim and provide adequate remuneration for rural mail-carriers. It is unfair to deprive part of the population of an absolutely essential service on the grounds that \$800 is too much pay for carriers who each year travel 3,328 miles with horse and buggy. It is ridiculous to fix a uniform rate for mail delivery or transport throughout the country, irrespective of which part of it you are in. Every case should be decided on its own merits. The hon. minister (Mr. Bertrand) did state, in fact, in this house, that his "was not a revenue department, but a service department". I therefore trust that, with his usual kindness, he will work out a solution consonant with the wishes and the needs of the localities of my