

I still say the bill should be thrown back, so that it may be revised and introduced in proper form.

Honourable members, I have tried to say a lot in a few minutes. I am not like some who talk often and long. I have tried to say as plainly and as briefly as I can what I mean. Once more I submit that it does not behoove this house to rush through so important a bill to please anybody, and it should not be done. I therefore have much pleasure in seconding the amendment, and I hope it will receive your favourable consideration.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Question!

Hon. NORMAN P. LAMBERT: Honourable senators, within the space of a few minutes I should like to summarize the position of this bill as I see it, and in doing so I hope I shall not be deemed guilty of repetition if I emphasize some of the points raised by my honourable friend from Lincoln (Hon. Mr. Bench). I regret I was not in my seat when he rose to speak.

I think the issue before this house on the amendment moved by the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) is not so much exchange control as the element of permanency in the bill. This house embarked upon a certain course of action when it established a precedent by referring the subject-matter to the Committee on Banking and Commerce before giving the bill second reading. When the question was discussed and decided upon it was quite competent for the Senate to have taken the action which my honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity now proposes. The honourable senator from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar) also had the opportunity to insist that the subject-matter be not referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee before second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I was not in the house at the time.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: I remember that in his speech he said he thought the bill should be rejected. His position then was the same as it is tonight. After the committee had been in session the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity moved an amendment and took a strong position on the subject—and he does still. I do not quarrel with him. I merely want to direct attention to the logic of the present situation. This house decided to refer the subject-matter to the Banking and Commerce Committee for consideration before second reading of the bill. In adopting that course the Senate acted wisely. As a result of

Hon. Mr. HUSHION.

the discussion before the Banking and Commerce Committee this week we are all a great deal better informed on the bill today.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: In that connection I gladly pay my tribute to the honourable senator from Vancouver-Burrard (Hon. Mr. McGeer) for enlightening us on many points of the bill. But having followed that course, and the committee now reporting in favour of the bill being given second reading subject to certain conditions, I think logically and morally we are almost bound to proceed with second reading and then refer the bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee for consideration of the amendments proposed.

At this stage I want again to emphasize that so far as I am concerned the issue at stake is not exchange control as a general proposition; it is the fixing permanently upon the people of this country of the controls specified in the bill. That is the issue. As a result of the discussion in the Banking and Commerce Committee on the subject-matter that issue has been dealt with very adequately. I have a very definite idea of what should be the life of this bill. When the Banking and Commerce Committee considers the bill, if the time limit suggested is not satisfactory, I am assuming that whatever is recommended by way of compromise may be made the subject of approach to the Acting Minister of Finance, in the hope that it will be acceptable to the government. I may say to the house now that while I am prepared to support second reading of the bill, if the proposed amendments which have been referred to in a general way tonight and provisionally accepted by the honourable leader on this side are not written into the bill, I reserve my right to vote against its being given third reading.

As to the point raised by the honourable senator from Alma (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) about utilizing the present order-in-council to deal with this situation instead of by statute, I would remind him that the view expressed by friends of the honourable gentleman has been very definitely in favour of doing away with order-in-council government as well as with controls. The two go together. I agree with that view.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: I submit therefore that the leader of the government in suggesting now that these controls should be put into statutory form and thus have the full authority of parliament behind them is at least beginning to adopt the oft-repeated recommendations of honourable members opposite