

there today a situation under which, unless you are a member of a trade union—and not only of a trade union, but one of the trade unions which is right inside—you are in an invidious position. I note that an hon. member shakes his head. I must frankly admit that I was greatly surprised, and I cannot give proof of what I say. All I can say is that I have asked serious people if that is so, and they have told me it is so, and that we have now, even in free England, a situation which we think of only in those states which we regard as the home of tyranny.

I might digress by referring to the fact that an unprecedented thing happened in England a month ago during the crisis when the weekly papers were—I will not say banned, but they were told to stop publication. I hold in my hand the *New Statesman and Nation*. I believe it can fairly be said that it is a very strong supporter of the government. I would say it is far to the left, but this publication read the government quite a lecture. As to the ban it said:

This suggests an attitude infinitely remote from present day realities. Lord Salisbury could afford to be as aloof as this; Mr. Attlee certainly cannot. But even Lord Salisbury would not have gone as far as Mr. Greenwood—

One of the ministers.

In reply to a question about the suspension of weekly periodicals he said: "I would not have thought that serious and enlightened opinion would suffer by having a fortnight in which to think for itself." The remark could scarcely have been worse. In the first place, it showed a remarkable indifference to the principle of the freedom of the press, and secondly, it implied that it did no harm to leave educated people without the facts and arguments on which to form an intelligent opinion.

I have rather digressed there, because it seems to me that when you will certain things, you will the consequences of those things. And when we start out with planning, it takes us a long way.

Let me give an illustration we ran across the other day in the banking and commerce committee. Incidentally I might say that the officials I met created a favourable impression. I should like to give an instance of just what happens and how far people can go. We had a case raised there where steel was being rationed for export. There was not enough to go round and the companies were being given only enough to make a kind of token export in order that they might be in position to keep their foreign connections. One company was denied steel, and the basis of that denial was perhaps plausible. It was considered that their form of manufacture was not likely to be long continued because

[Mr. Macdonnell.]

they were selling to Holland and it was thought that purchases by Holland might not continue very long because we had made a loan to Holland and they were buying with the proceeds of that loan. Another company was allowed to export. The officials were quite frank about it, as I say, and they put forward an argument which was interesting and which you could not brush aside.

My only point is this: When you start planning, where do you go? It seems to me that inevitably you drift into the position where you must begin to play the part of Providence. Several times within the last couple of days we have heard the phrase "orderly decontrol". I think that is a reasonable phrase, but we have also heard the phrase, "we must not decontrol until all risk is removed." I do not think the minister used that phrase, but it has been used. The officials get that idea and I think it is inevitable that they should. I am just pointing out that when we start this planning business we start on a path which takes us far.

I want to mention another place where it takes us, and in this connection I intend to read an extract from the report of the war-time prices and trade board. We come to the point where we are making criminals out of our citizens. That is another thing we should have in mind. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) ruined one basic part of this speech by announcing yesterday the decontrol of prices on used motor cars. I sent him a note of remonstrance and told him that I thought he should delay it. However, I am not going to hold a grudge against him but I admit this part of my speech would have been much better if they were still under control. However, they were under control at this time yesterday. At least, we did not know that they were being decontrolled; only the press knew that.

I want to read this, and I am very serious about it because it just shows where we go when 51 per cent of us undertake to invade the rights of the other 49 per cent. People will say, "Do we not invade their rights in the matter of education; do we not invade their rights in the matter of tariffs?" My answer is, "Yes, we do; you have to have a tariff. You cannot have every one making his own tariff." The hon. member for Rose-town-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) shakes his head there, but we do have to have a tariff. While you and I may not agree about it, we have to work under the same tariff. If 51 per cent vote for it, we have to have it.