supported price fixing for the duration of the war. I supported the continuation of price control until the flow of consumer goods to the Canadian market should remove the danger of inflation. But when I gave this support I war fully aware of the necessity for some revisions in certain lines as we got along into the post-war period. It should have been perfectly obvious to the government that even before the war, producers of staples and ordinary commercial goods operated on a very narrow margin of profit. Further they should know that in the last two years production costs have gone up materially. With a much narrowed margin of profit, increased costs and restricted volume, producers certainly have been in a squeeze. Where was the incentive, therefore, to increase production to meet the demands of this time? It has been a heart-breaking business for producers to get long overdue revisions of an obsolete price control structure. If our country is to meet the desperate needs of this most critical time, the government will have to revise quickly and sensibly its price policy. And, what is just as important, it seems to me that the hordes of officials, large and small, will have to be paired down to a minimum; for today it is almost impossible to get quick action because of the many strata of bureaucrats through whose hands things have to go for final decision.

I do not advocate by any means even now the complete removal or abolition of the price controls, but I do say that in many cases there must be a fair revision of ceiling prices if we are to release the flood of ordinary commodities that the world needs in such a desperate hurry We are not so concerned about the luxury goods, on which there has always been a very large margin of profit, but we are concerned about ordinary consumer goods.

The government, it seems to me, must wake up and do something about this very important matter—and do it soon. If agriculture is successfully to respond to the call for increased food volume, then the farmers of Canada, and in particular of western Canada, will have to be assured of a much better supply of labour than they can see available at the present time.

What is the government doing about it? Is there coordinated effort among the departments of Labour, Agriculture and National Defence to speed up demobilization and rehabilitation of the men in the services, and to make many of them available for the work of food production? I have noted that our cities recently have become full of idle people, thousands of them drawing unemployment insurance.

His Excellency's speech mentioned the recently concluded agreement for a loan to Great Britain of $1,250 million. I personally was glad to see that this credit had been made available to Great Britain. As a matter of fact a similar credit should have been arranged for Great Britain last fall. I am satisfied that if the various parts of the commonwealth had risen to the occasion last autumn, they collectively could have prevented the United States from bludgeoning Great Britain into submission to the nefarious Bretton Woods agreement.

But while I am pleased to see a huge new credit advanced, which will I feel stimulate trade between our two countries and materially contribute to employment in Canada, yet I think the loan should have been made to Great Britain interest free. Two per cent on the yearly balance outstanding will, in time, be found to clutter up and finally to make impossible the balancing of payments between Great Britain and Canada, especially if we persist in maintaining our senseless system of financing foreign trade.

While I am speaking about trade, may I offer one word of comment on that part of the speech from the throne which reads:

> Employment and income alike are bound up with the restoration and expansion of world trade. To the productive employment of vast numbers of Canadians, export markets are essential.
>
> The government has steadily pursued its efforts to restore former markets, to secure new markets, and generally to expand peace-time markets. In pursuit of this policy, export credits for which additional provision was made at the last session, have been extended to several of our wartime allies.

This, Mr. Speaker, seems to indicate no new approach whatever to the government's plan of foreign trade. It is essentially the same old approach. I see nothing in the speech from the throne of His Excellency, nor yet in what the government is doing, to assure me that they are determined to look after the home market—the very best market we have.

If foreign trade continues to be the main objective of the country's productive effort, then we are going to see the same old races for markets, the same old idea of favourable trade balances, followed by economic and military war. But if the emphasis is changed so that consumption, first at home and then abroad, becomes the objective of our production effort, then foreign trade in normal times will be concerned only with our real surpluses—that is, those over and above what the people of Canada want and can use.

When those surpluses are trade into other countries, Canada must be prepared to receive goods and services in payment for them. And