smaller amount than another company, or twice as much as other companies, and there is no appeal. He can tell a board of directors that their judgment is bad in setting up a reserve for bad debts, and if he thinks it is, he can disallow the reserve. He can give or withhold an increase in standard profits where more capital has been put into a business; he may give it in one case and withhold it in another, and there is no effective appeal. He is in the position of being virtually policeman, judge, jury and court of appeal, all in one. When I was reading that I was reminded of the old saying about the imperial House of Commons. It seems to me that, like the imperial House of Commons, the minister in his discretion can do anything "except make a man a woman or a woman a man".

Another point is that appeals are extremely difficult. So far as the ordinary person is concerned, appeals are almost impossible. In the first place, there is no appeal against the minister's discretion. Second, an appeal cannot succeed unless the minister has applied the law wrongly. He has good lawyers to protect him against that. The third ground is where he has not heard the application. The net result is that you have virtually no appeal. Where a company wants to appeal, it must take its affairs into court and they are spread over the record for the whole world to see. Companies in competitive relationship do not want to do that.

The minister has admitted that he has revision in mind. He referred to a revision of the personal income tax, but he said that he had decided that the time was not yet ripe. I would urge that the time gets less ripe every year it is delayed. The longer it is delayed, the worse it will be. I urge that the time has come to do it, and this revision should not be confined to the personal income tax. I suggest that when the minister does come to do it he should associate with the inquiry some person with long business administrative experience who can bring in a more or less common sense point of view.

No speech on the subject of finance should ignore the question of employment. Employment in Canada has always gone along with foreign trade. It is wrong to say that we have never had full employment in this country except when there was a war. We have had virtually full employment whenever our export business was high. This raises a very serious consideration which we should all take deeply to heart. We have had tremendous exports over the last four or five years, and we all know why. We all know it has been because we have been exporting tanks, planes and other munitions of war. That has come to an end. Unless we are able to replace those exports with other exports, the position of things is going to be very difficult indeed. We should be desiring with our whole being and facilitating in any way we can the creation of a world wherein trade will move with the greatest possible freedom. We should be praying and hoping that these discussions which are taking place in Washington will succeed.

Let us take a look at Canada's position in the world. Where would we be in a regionalized world, in a world divided into blocs? Let us consider those blocs. Let us consider the sterling bloc and the dollar bloc. What countries will be in the sterling bloc? Presumably the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Belgium. perhaps France, probably India, the British dominions other than Canada, and the British colonies. And what will be in the dollar bloc? Canada, the United States, the Caribbean countries, the South American countries, possibly some of the Pacific countries; and someone has suggested China will be competed for. I want to correct myself. Canada does not fit into either bloc. History and economic development fit us into the sterling bloc; geography makes us part of the dollar bloc. We fall between two stools. The London *Economist*, in discussing the question of the sterling bloc, said Canada would be of necessity outside, and the editor included Newfoundland too. "Canada would necessarily remain outside", he said.

I say that that is a situation of the utmost gravity for us. I repeat that we ought to do everything in our power—I hope we are doing so, and I believe we are—to make these conversations succeed.

Mr. MAYBANK: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MACDONNELL: Will the hon. member allow me to finish?

Mr. MAYBANK: Just as you like.

Mr. MACDONNELL: I was saying that I think it is of the greatest importance that we should try to free the channels of trade. We should hope with all the earnestness of which we are capable that these conferences now going on in Washington will succeed.

I was going on to say that I can understand why people in Great Britain are troubled. They feel that if the United States steps into some arrangement, and later on seeks to withdraw, it will be much more competent for them with their huge home market to do so, than for Britain. I can understand that. Britain fears that perhaps the United States have not yet learned that trade is a two-way street. But it seems to me that we can