

we shall impose them; but where? Shall they be imposed on the farmer who has raised the price of his produce 200 per cent above the 1939 level? Shall it be given to him? Shall a control be imposed on the food producers whose costs have gone up 200 per cent?

Mr. ARGUE: The farmer is already controlled in the price of everything he sells today.

Mr. HARTT: These things are not fundamental—

Mr. ARGUE: Come on out in the country and say that.

Mr. HARTT: I hear speeches about the poor farmers; the next thing we are going to do for the farmer is to chew the food and put it into his mouth. Don't tell me—

Mr. McMASTER: Liberal policy.

Mr. KNOWLES: What does the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) think of that?

Mr. MacNICOL: He shakes his head.

Mr. HARTT: I hope the time taken up in cross-fire by the hon. gentlemen will not be counted on my time. If you take any chart, and if you are objectively sincere in your statement, you will find that the cost of food, judged on 1939 levels, has risen 200 per cent. I have a chart which was published in the *New York Times* last Sunday which I am willing to produce and deposit with the house, and let any hon. member refute that statement. If you are thinking of your constituency, perhaps you will be able to get a few more farmer votes. Then, go ahead and do it, but the truth must be faced. I represent an urban constituency, and if we have to pay seventy-one cents a pound for butter it is because in this house you are hollered down, you are told you must not speak about the farmer. Well, now, somebody has to tell the farmer that we know what we are paying today. Industrials have gone up 162 per cent, according to the *New York Times*; but if we are given controls, shall the controls be imposed today at the present levels? Would the C.C.F. suggest that? Would they impose subsidies? Would they offer subsidies to the farmers whose products have risen 200 per cent? Apparently that is not practical; that is not acceptable; that is not desirable; and from what we have seen of what has happened in England and from what we have seen happen in Soviet Russia, controls and subsidies are the shortest way to bankruptcy.

If Prime Minister Attlee had to come out and say, "We need more production, we want

our workers not to ask for a higher increase in wages—" and these are the words of Attlee. If Bevin had to use the same language, if Sir Stafford Cripps had to ask for it, what would happen to the economy of Canada; if the C.C.F. were in power here? They would have to impose the same conditions. England is today spending one billion and a half in subsidies, and they do not know how to get rid of them. Consequently I do not see that the suggestion is practical. I read in a letter published in the *Citizen* that milk is as expensive in Scotland as it is in Canada. It is selling at about fourteen cents a quart over there, and I am willing to produce that letter from a visitor to England to that effect. Therefore, when you insist that the Canadian people be given subsidies and that controls be put on the economy of the country you are misleading yourself and you are misleading the people of Canada.

Alternately you say, "We produced an amendment and if you do not accept our amendment we may go on strike." I think hon. gentlemen are much too public-minded to make statements of that kind. They know their obligation to the country, and if this government is wrong in presenting any kind of remedy it is best for hon. gentlemen who are on the committee to fight from inside and remedy the conditions, but not threaten to go on strike. As a matter of fact, I do not think they will go on strike. Personally I think they will be vocal inside and outside of parliament so that their electors will read what action they have taken.

The Social Credit party object to the word "recently" in the motion. I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that the word "recently" is appropriate, as you will see, and I recommend the financial chart of the *New York Times* to hon. members, which indicates definitely that the cost of living has risen sharply since 1946, not only in Canada but in the United States. The same thing applies to England and to the other countries. If it has risen since 1946 and we are now in the first months of 1948 it has risen recently, I submit to the leader of the third opposition party. Hon. gentlemen know what happened in this world cataclysm from which we have just emerged and the general economic dislocation which has taken place.

When the Prime Minister, speaking in this house, said that conditions have developed beyond the control of Canada, a roar of laughter went up from the Conservatives. What would actually have happened if Canada had been an airtight compartment administering its own economy, and having