

measure during the resolution stage, though the fighting stage of the emergency is over, we do not believe that the disruption of the world economy caused by the war has been anything like overcome; and until that disruption is repaired and the economy is restored, we shall continue to be in a state of emergency. Therefore, regardless of what may be said to the contrary, and what sneers and slurs may be cast in the direction of this party, we do not hesitate to say, and indeed we proclaim, that if we were back—and it appears that this is where some people would want to bring us—to where we were in September, 1939, certain government controls and certain government planning would still be necessary, and I am satisfied that I can prove that point before I sit down.

In my opinion, those who claim that the need for controls has disappeared fail to take certain things into consideration. They fail to realize the extent of the disruption of the world economy during the war. They fail to realize the sick state of the world at the present time; and, most serious of all, they do not seem to realize how inadequately their so-called private enterprise functioned in the decade before world war II. I was in this house during that decade, the ten years between 1929 and 1939, and every hon. member who has any understanding of that period realizes that during those years we were exercising emergency controls. The Conservative government in office in 1931, brought in a measure known as the Unemployment and Farm Relief Act, which took amazingly wide control; and with very little change that act was enacted each year from 1931 to 1940, when the war rescued us from the mess into which private enterprise had gotten us.

I would suggest to hon. friends to my right, who are so much opposed to controls, that they should read an editorial which appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* of some few weeks back. That editorial was entitled "Storm Clouds Ahead", and dealt with the serious consequences to this country of economic collapse or a long drawn-out recovery in the United Kingdom. It said, in part:

Britain in her economic illness cannot be quarantined.

And that is equally true of the other countries in Europe.

If economic woe should befall her, or if recovery from her existing desperate straits should take years, then the repercussions for this country would be hard indeed. What is ahead of us in this. That unless by some miracle which we have no right to expect, unless by some tribute from fate which only fools should expect, Britain should recover quickly and Europe arise from chaos within the next few years, we are head-

ing straight for grave trouble, with our only hope a greatly accelerated trade represented by Canadian exports to the United States.

I maintain that we must take into consideration not only conditions within this country, because conditions within this country alone are not sufficient for our prosperity and our safety as a nation—so I would say that, unless we can disprove the correctness of the diagnosis made by this editorial, then we should hesitate before we eliminate controls and a certain amount of planning from our economy.

Because of my experience during the last fifteen years, I was disturbed when I heard both the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply (Mr. Howe) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilesley) state, earlier in the debate on this measure, that the government's policy is to return as quickly as possible to a free economy. To talk about a free economy at the present time is, in my opinion nonsense. There is no such thing as a free economy today. In other words, what my hon. friends want to return to is the status quo before the war. A darcy once was asked what the status quo was, and his reply was, "It is the same damned old mess." When my friends talk about a return to a free economy, that is what they want us to return to, the pre-war mess.

But let me say that that is not what those right hon. gentlemen and their party promised the people of this country during the election campaign of 1945. It was not what we were promised in the first speech from the throne following the return of the government at that election. In the speech from the throne at the first session of the twentieth parliament, I find these words:

In the building of a new order—

A new order is not a return to a free economy, because that was the old order. And it was a pretty miserable one for a great many people.

In the building of a new order my ministers are determined to seek above all else the promotion of peace, work and health in domestic and international relations. To further these great objectives the government has received a definite mandate from the people of Canada.

I suggest to the government that, while I do not say the controls we now have are sufficient to bring us into a new social order, I do say that, while the government is preparing its plans, these controls should be maintained; that is, those of them that are necessary.

As I have said, to go back to a free economy is not building a new social order. It is slip-