

Ottawa to settle it, the province of Nova Scotia will be depleted in a very short time. Hundreds of men who were in that industry during this war are leaving Nova Scotia and seeking work in other parts of Canada, because apparently no one is trying to do anything in the way of settling that strike.

I mention this merely because I want to drive home the point of controls. It all adds up to public responsibility. When a member is elected to the House of Commons, or a government is formed, the people who send that member here or delegate power to the government expect that government to give them leadership and to supervise the economy of the country and see that everyone is guaranteed the right to live in the country, that someone does not make a million dollars while another is on relief. That is their job, and when I hear some of our provincial people who believe in retaining provincial autonomy talking, they have been overseers of the poor for thirty years. That is all they are. There has been no government in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island. They want to hang on to something that exalts themselves. It is that vanity of man again, wanting to hang on to a little bit of power for himself.

I would never try to defend our provincial premier about the bickering and squabbling that he goes on with in this matter of provincial rights. This is where the power rests. There must be some central direction, and the people of Nova Scotia under the federal proposals would have been a hundred per cent better off than they could be in dealing with that little ox-cart government down there. I strongly urge what I suggested before to the Minister of Reconstruction—and I have a great deal of respect for him, too. There must be a great many Tories over there who keep him back, because I think that as an engineer and a practical man he knows the problem and wants to get things done, never mind the money. That is the proper attitude. There is something over there holding him back or he would have settled that strike, provided the necessary subsidies or got some kind of machinery in action. I suggest to him that he try to get together with the Minister of Labour and come to some understanding. It looks bad to see this situation: the Minister of Reconstruction makes a statement in the house to the effect—I think this was on April 1—that he was prepared to sit down with the industry and the union and work out some kind of subsidy arrangement by which that matter might be settled.

Mr. HOMUTH: That was April Fool's day.

Mr. KNOWLES: The date of your amendment.

Mr. GILLIS: Regardless of what date it was, the statement was made publicly and officially by a member of the cabinet. Then a few days later there is a statement from the Department of Labour—not from the minister but from some of his officials—to the effect that no subsidies will be provided to clean up that problem in Nova Scotia. I suggest that they get together.

I am not sure that my friends to my right or their coalition on our extreme left can stand up in this house and tell me that the coal industry, the steel industry, the shipping industry, the fishing industry, or the textile industry—all basic industries in this country—are better off today than they were during this war when the government were planning production, allocating materials, and supervising the general income of the country. There is no comparison. If it could be done in time of war, there is no reason why it should not be a hundred per cent easier to do it in time of peace. I cannot understand it. I would advise my Conservative friends over there to do a little checking up. They are venomous on this matter of controls and free enterprise. The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker)—I am sorry he is not here now—is a man for whom I have a great deal of respect. He is a lawyer, a good reasoner, and logical in practically everything except where he sits. On this matter of controls he gave the Conservative party some very good advice back in 1942. Speaking at the business men's club in Toronto, he said this:

No one can successfully argue that principles of the Victorian era can cope with the conditions in times that produce Sir Stafford Cripps, (a socialist) as deputy prime minister (of Britain), and William Temple as Archbishop of Canterbury.

He goes on to tell about that kind of thing, but the meat of his remarks is farther down, where he says, "Bureaucracy is danger". The article reads:

Mr. Diefenbaker said the danger exists of government by bureaucracy after the war.

"The Liberal party today stands for reaction, the C.C.F. for complete nationalization, which will destroy private enterprise," he said. "The Conservative party must meet this challenge that comes to it and show the people that our economic system shall continue to be one of free enterprise under stringent control . . ."

The caption of the article was "Advises Tories to Modernize".

Mr. MacINNIS: How could the Tories modernize?