

occupy the treasury benches, their demeanour in the matter under discussion would have been entirely different.

The government says there is a national emergency; it presents as evidence of the fact a list of the articles which are still under control. I do not wish to be amusing; I turn to the items covering ladies wear. It is a long list, but it hardly creates a national emergency. I might turn to some agricultural implements that it is well that farmers should have. I might even condole with my dear friend the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), who votes with me even when I am wrong, and say that I regret that he cannot now sell his old automobile at a high price since it was removed from control yesterday; but, Mr. Speaker, when we speak of a national emergency we are speaking of something that threatens the very life, the existence of the country. We are not speaking of some petty, puny, paltry expedient that may be resorted to to maintain a party in power or to meet the whim of some leader powerful in that party.

Mr. Speaker, the emergency which justifies the trampling under foot of a country's constitution is not a petty thing; it is something that is overwhelming; it is something that threatens the life and the soul of a nation. This long list of sundry conveniences and requirements laid on the table to-day does not represent the type of emergency that justifies the suspension of the constitution. Nothing less than the crushing hoofs of the horses of the Apocalypse, something like flood, famine, pestilence or war, can constitute a national emergency. Nothing else can justify the action the government has outlined in this bill. No such emergency is established by the list of petty wants offered to a sorrowing house late yesterday afternoon.

Mr. J. O. PROBE (Regina City): I have waited a long time, weeks now, to have an opportunity to present a few words on the subject matter under debate today, as to whether economic controls should be allowed to lapse or whether they should be continued. Like the genial hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Arsenault), who spoke a few moments ago, I wonder whether the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) has taken more props from under our feet during the very time that we are debating the matter of continuing these controls.

This afternoon I listened attentively to able arguments by two of my hon. friends from the Progressive Conservative party. Personally I am happy to hear their policies so keenly expounded, even though their policies are not looked on by myself or my party with the

greatest favour. I should like to say to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) who argued, as no doubt a brilliant lawyer should, the case for discontinuance of controls on the ground of provincial autonomy, whatever that may happen to mean in a lawyer's vocabulary, that it seems to me it is a term which has been used to cover almost any legislation that he may want to oppose when he has no other reason to do so.

In suggesting that controls be discontinued, the hon. member for Stanstead made reference to the fact that we have not in this country an emergency such as that of war or of flood or of pestilence. The hon. gentleman with his background differs considerably with me because of mine. While in his own circle of acquaintances when there is not a war there may not be any emergency, I must say that during my upbringing from a child my family and my friends have always lived in a state of economic emergency from day to day. I think that is as important in their lives as is a state of war in the life of a nation. When that third or that half of a nation is facing daily calamities that are as serious to them as war is to a nation, to argue provincial autonomy to evade our responsibility is, in spite of the brilliance of the argument, an utter evasion of the case.

I was impressed by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell), whose address is always interesting, and I wish to refer to one or two of the remarks he made. For example, in referring to my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), who spoke yesterday and referred to cut-throat competition and monopoly exploitation, the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario attempted to show that these two terms were contradictory to one another; that it was impossible to have cut-throat competition on the one hand and monopoly exploitation from the same source. I would point out to my hon. friend that while the two things may not be simultaneous they are definitely consecutive in the scheme of economics as it exists under what is called private enterprise. Undoubtedly, when capitalism had its beginnings, there was a form of competition. In its early stages, markets were limitless and there was no need for other than healthy competition as between producers. As I say, there were markets. As the markets became restricted, however, there was for those who wished to exist in the competitive field the need either to restrict their activities or to eliminate those who competed with them; so we stepped from competition to cut-throat competition; and, as more and more throats were cut, eventually we reached the stage