

make a fair return on their capital. I say once again that as soon as possible the Government should remove the ceiling prices on goods whose consumption does not seriously affect the cost of living or foreign exchange. Also the income tax ought to be entirely removed. If these things were done a great impetus would be given to trade and the general development of the country. I have never been one who believed that we could have full employment in Canada. I am by no means a pessimist, but if you want to succeed in public life or in business or any other career a sane optimism is not enough; you must have also a sane regard for economy and many other things. If the Government adopted my suggestions, even in part, the morale of the people would be strengthened, their apathy would disappear and they would once more have the courage and ambition to make Canada greater.

Honourable senators know as well as I do that no other country in the world offers the same opportunities that Canada does. As was said last night at the birthday party to the Prime Minister, the reputation and status of Canada are high throughout the world. I am in favour of selected immigration. There are many experts in European arts and crafts who could be admitted here to our great advantage. And if my suggestions were put into effect capital also would flow into Canada.

I have spoken altogether too long, but I should like to say a few more words. I very much doubt that they will be heeded, but I am inspired to make them by a story I read in a Toronto paper this morning to the effect that Parliament and the Government are considering making some changes in our parliamentary procedure to bring it into closer conformity with that of the British Parliament. As honourable senators are aware, the Imperial House of Commons assigns a certain number of days—usually about three—to the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the debate concludes within the time set. Similarly, on other important subjects—it may be foreign affairs, for instance—a limit of one or two days is fixed for debate. But in this country when the Address is being considered, every honourable member of another place feels that he must make a speech; and afterwards, at great cost to the country, he mails Hansard out to all the voters in his constituency. When they come to the budget they appoint a committee composed of members from each party. This committee goes thoroughly into the estimates and reports them to the House. I for one would very much like to see that system inaugurated here. No doubt there

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE.

would be a cry to high Heaven that under our democratic system such a practice would never do. But here we are in the closing hours of the session, with supplementary estimates running into millions of dollars which we have had no opportunity to consider at all. The Main Estimates we have to a certain extent considered in the Finance Committee. The honourable leader of the Government told me this morning that if honourable members desired further details he was quite willing that the House should resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose. But the same old system has been followed ever since I have been a member of either House: everything is thrown at us in the dying hours of the session. It is not fair to us, it is not fair to Parliament, and it is not fair to the people of Canada. I do hope that some change will be made to remedy this unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Hon. THOMAS A. CRERAR: Of the statements made by my old colleague of former days there is one that I agree with and one that I cannot agree with. As to procedure in the other House, I wholly share his view. For a good many years I have felt that members in the Commons seem unable to discipline themselves to an orderly consideration of the all-important business that comes before them. As my honourable friend has said, days and weeks are wasted in debate on matters that should be disposed of within a reasonable length of time. Then with the approaching end of the session there is a great urge to get business through, and often important legislation fails to receive adequate consideration. I join my voice in the protest, made in this Chamber more than once, against a mass of important legislation being sent here in the closing days of the session when it is impossible to devote to it the time necessary for thorough consideration. I hope that eventually some remedy will be found for this unsatisfactory state of affairs.

The other statement of my honourable friend which I should like to agree with, but cannot, is that the income tax should be removed entirely.

Hon. Mr. HARDY: I noticed at the time that the honourable gentleman used the term income tax, but I knew he meant the excess profits tax.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to it. I intended to say excess profits tax.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Then I find myself in the happy position of being able to agree with my honourable friend on both points.