

many corporations. I want to quote a few more just to emphasize what I mean when I say that no hardship will result to the corporations by the imposition of the excess profits tax.

These figures are taken from the *Financial Post* of November 15, 1947, and have been quoted before during this debate. In 1945 the Simpson Company had a profit of \$1,425,858. In 1946 their profit was \$3,656,851, an increase of \$2,230,993, or 156 per cent. That was a substantial increase in one year, which I believe was quite unnecessary. Zellers increased their profits in 1946 over 1945 by \$231,967. Dominion Stores increased their 1946 profits over 1945 by \$456,116. Loblaw Groceries increased their profits in 1946 over 1945 by \$566,668. Canadian Bakeries, while they are apparently a smaller concern, increased their 1946 profits over 1945 by \$71,669. Canadian Canneries increased their 1946 profits over 1945 by \$697,144. The Borden Company increased theirs by \$7,487,034; Silverwood Dairies increased theirs by \$263,754; H. R. MacMillan Export Company alone increased theirs by \$1,097,075. I gave the figures for Massey-Harris last night, and there are more figures here with which I shall not weary the house. I submit those only to emphasize again that I do not believe any hardship will result to these corporations by the reimposition of the excess profits tax.

Again, if these extra profits had not been made in 1946—and undoubtedly they will be still higher in 1947, according to all accounts we see in the papers—they could have been handled in one of two ways by the companies themselves. They could have been used to reduce the costs of the manufactured article, or they could have been used to increase the wage to the workers of those industries. As those corporations did neither, I see no reason why the government and the public should not have the benefit of those profits as a redistribution of income when there is low purchasing power on the part of many of our citizens, in order to level off the income in these days of high prices.

I know that some people will say that those increases in profits are not from profiteering. They will say that it was increased business which made them possible. That is a possibility; I do not deny it. But I have been listening for a good many years to certain types of advertising by businesses in this country, by means of which they drill into the mind of the consumer and the customer that volume cuts cost. If the volume of their business increased to the point where their profits increased as I have indicated by the

[Mr. Bentley.]

figures I have quoted, obviously the volume did cut cost; and somehow that cut in the cost should have been handed on to the wage earners, the consumers, or to the public treasury. These are the reasons why our leader early in the year gave voice to the six-point program he proposed, all based on the things which we believe and which have been supported generally in the speeches from this, the C.C.F. section of the house.

Our leader asked for the following measures: reimposition of price control; renewal of the subsidies on a number of things; the closing of the Winnipeg grain exchange, which could be done; reconstruction of the wartime prices and trade board—while it may be a big job, it is not impossible; continuation of the excess profits tax after December 31, 1947, and rationing, if necessary, on some essential commodities. In spite of the courageous speeches made by members from the other side of the house, including the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank), the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) and, I believe, the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Bertrand), the government has made it clear that it will not even give consideration to the imposition of price controls, the continuation of subsidies, or the imposition of the excess profits tax. That makes me wonder what the government hope to accomplish by the setting up of this committee. Do they expect a miracle, Mr. Speaker? I am sure they do not want it. It may happen.

The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) cited four things which would not be done; and if none of those four things is done, the committee will serve no purpose whatsoever except to provide a place in which members may spend their time instead of being here in the house or somewhere else. The chances against the miracle are great, because the committee is to be watched over by the eagle eye of a cabinet minister who will want the government policy—which is to discover nothing—carried out. He will be ably assisted by partisan members who will be equally subservient to government requirements.

The vast majority of Canadians have already said that they want price control. Let us see what the farmers have to say. I have here a leaflet containing the resolutions adopted at the fourteenth annual convention of the British Columbia federation of agriculture. This resolution, among others, was passed:

Whereas president H. H. Hannam of the Canadian federation of agriculture has issued a call to action to all member bodies of the federation, urging a nation-wide campaign of petitions, telegrams, delegations to members of parliament, and protest meetings, designed to