

The principle so far as I can make out has always been more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

There is one other point which I wish to make and which I think is important, although it has not exactly to do with the working of the bill. It is simply background for the questions which I am working up to and which I want to ask the minister. I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that it is not cynical to suggest that this arrangement whereby people have to come to Ottawa, not to get their rights by reason of law but to get their rights by reason of the favour of this many-sided or multilateral minister is one which places them in a difficult position. It is not human for a man to come here and get the permission which he wants and go away and feel evilly disposed toward the minister or toward the party to which the minister belongs. That is just not human nature. I think we should put it on record that this is a perfectly magnificent way to obtain political support. Indeed it does not need much imagination to reach the conclusion that if this kind of thing goes on long enough a situation will arise which might be very desirable for the government. That is, if you had enough power of this kind in the hands of the government it would be almost impossible to defeat the government. It would be like the fascist governments with which we are all so familiar. You would have too many people afraid to speak their minds: you would have too many people becoming just yes-men, and in the end you would find an absolute breakdown of our whole system of government.

I try to use moderate words when I am speaking on a subject of this kind, even though I may not on other occasions, but I think that making the whole business subject to one man is one of the most dangerous and objectionable things which have faced this House of Commons for many days. It is simply war mentality being carried on into peace and I think it is most undesirable.

Mr. ABBOTT: Would my hon. friend permit me to interrupt for a moment? I want to move that the committee rise before six o'clock in order that I may move certain changes in the personnel of the committee which has just been set up.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I wish to make just a few comments about the details of the bill. In the first place, we want to know what the bill is. We understand that a good many changes have been made in it. We know there have been some

and we understand that there have been many more. It seems as though the government—and perhaps we should not be too unsympathetic toward them—just dumped everything in. I think that is what the government did in their hurry, or perhaps in their panic. Since then, they have been giving the matter a more careful look and they have taken out certain things. I hope the minister will now—not later—give us a full statement of the schedules with any changes which have been made. Would it be possible for the minister to do that at eight o'clock?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have the revised schedules ready. I had thought that I might put them in when we were considering the schedules themselves in the interests of order, but I am quite willing to meet the wishes of the committee on that. While I am on my feet—and I am sure my hon. friend will not object to my answering his question now—may I say that these schedules were not prepared, as he has suggested, in twenty-four hours, nor was everything dumped into them. They represented months and months of work by a competent interdepartmental committee.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I did not say how long the dumping process went on.

Mr. ABBOTT: I hope none of us desire to have the reputation of being either a mule or a jellyfish. Obviously changes had to be made when it was shown that it was necessary that they should be made. Because of the very nature of things, advance notice could not be given of these proposals and business could not be consulted to see how they might affect particular trades. My own surprise is that it has been found necessary to make so few. I want to contradict as strongly as I can any intimation that these are hastily considered schedules.

The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) asked how much of our holdings of gold and United States dollars, aggregating \$513,884,563, as announced on January 29, was in gold. The answer is that \$296,008,031 was in gold. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): When the committee meets this evening will the minister tell us whether there were any unusual transactions, any windfalls, in the gold situation, whether any gold came in