

I hope the government will grant the many requests they have received concerning this discriminatory charge, since I believe these are the only two toll bridges in the country.

In closing I wish to assure the government that any remarks I made were made in good faith, because I thought it was my duty to make them and because I thought I was faithfully carrying out my mandate by expressing those views as frankly as I could. Despite my remarks and those few suggestions which I would like to see carried out, I wish to assure the government of my full support.

To be sure, conditions could be better than they are now; however, I do not think this country can be led by better men than we have now, or men more anxious to give their best to ensure the greatest measure of welfare to our fellow countrymen under the difficult conditions that now exist throughout the world.

I shall therefore vote for the address in reply to the speech from the throne, against the amendment and against the amendment to the amendment, because they offer no solution to present-day problems and merely amount to a motion of non-confidence in the best government our country ever had. Such a motion I could never support with my vote.

(Text):

Mr. J. M. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, before turning to the subject on which I wish to detain the house for only a few moments I should like to make one or two comments on the speech of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Picard), to which I listened with keen interest. I refer particularly to what he said about the desirability of debates in the house on foreign affairs being more actively participated in, and I agree fully with him. He of course has had the advantage of being abroad this summer, and was therefore able to speak about these matters with a certainty of touch which the rest of us could hardly have. Nevertheless we are an international power now, and it seems to me the time has long since passed when we should get rid of what seems to have been almost a taboo on the subject of foreign affairs. I do hope that what has been said tonight by the hon. member for Bellechasse will bear fruit.

I was of course also delighted with another statement he made in answer to a question from one of my colleagues as to why he

The Address—Mr. J. M. Macdonnell

supported the government. He said, and I hoped he said it sadly, "Oh, that would take a long time to explain". I took great comfort from that, and I hope not without justification.

My only excuse for rising a second time in the debate, even to speak for only a few moments, is a statement made in the house the other day which it seems to me was entirely wide of the mark and completely removed from reality. I should like to take a few moments of the time of the house to bring it back to what I, at any rate, consider to be a realistic view of the situation. I refer to the remark made the other day by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sinclair), in answer to a question as to whether the Bank of Canada supported Dominion of Canada bonds. He sought to suggest that, really, the Bank of Canada had no responsibility. I sympathized with him, because I thought he was given the rather ungrateful task of trying to explain something which I think cannot be explained, because I do not think it is a fact. He practised hair-splitting and, indeed, evasiveness, which I do not think is characteristic of him but which, nevertheless, I suggest was characteristic of the statement he made the other day.

I should like to point out in passing that this attitude of running away from responsibility, trying to pretend that the bank had nothing to do with this, is a change—oh, such a change—from the attitude of some years ago, when we were treated to any number of boasts as to what the bank was doing, how it controlled this and that, how it knew all the answers, and so on, and so on. Indeed, I propose to read a little later a statement by no less a person than Mr. Ilesley, to show that even the careful Mr. Ilesley was led a pretty long way toward saying that they had the answers, and that it was now really possible to control all kinds of things, which they have since learned cannot be controlled.

I should like to point out that I am not questioning the importance of these powers; far from it. What I am questioning is this apparent desire to run away from the fact and to treat the house to statements which I think do very little credit to its intelligence, and which we should not be asked to accept.

I should like first of all to read a short statement from the *Financial Post* of November 24, which sets out what is I am sure the unquestioned belief of the ordinary man of business, in the financial world, as to what