

The Address—Mr. Fahey

the intention of all of us to have this debate concluded as soon as possible, but I wish to mention one other matter.

So far, with the exception of my remarks on transportation, I have contented myself with discussing matters that are referred to in the speech from the throne. There were one or two points, however, that I hoped would be mentioned but which were not. There is no reference to the possibility of the establishment of a Canada council as recommended by the royal commission on the arts, letters and sciences. I mention this first of all because of a fairly recent article in a periodical which delights in finding fault with anything that the government proposes. The article referred sarcastically to this recommendation of the commission as asking for the appointment of an expensive body to do a job which the universities can do without further advice.

In the second place, because for many years I have personally championed vocational and technical education, I have been accused in my own province of not being interested in the arts or the humanities. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we always seem to be faced with a choice? We are either one thing or the other. We never seem to be given credit for being interested in two things at the same time. It is my experience that most people with competence in the technical field are a good deal more interested in the arts and humanities than many who pose as intellectuals. It seems to me that we have been subsidizing industry in many ways for the production of articles and tangible things. Why should we not now subsidize in some way those capable Canadians who are able and willing, with help, to produce those intangibles which we all really crave?

We boast proudly of our stature as a nation and our position in the councils of the world. As members of parliament we content ourselves with spending our time in dealing with things and not with people. It seems to me that we should now devise some form of subsidy to encourage capable Canadians in the production of those things which we crave, and thus provide for the rest of us an opportunity to grow in mental stature and appreciation of those intangibles, the enjoyment of which brings to man his fullest development. It would be my hope that before this session ends the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) might find it possible to make an announcement with regard to this important matter.

Mr. H. O. White (Middlesex East): At the very outset I want to convey my congratulations in the traditional way to the mover

[Mr. Fahey.]

(Mr. Leduc) and the seconder (Mr. Carrick) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Also at this time I should congratulate the Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rowe) upon his wonderful contribution to the debate this afternoon. To the new members of the house I want to say a word of welcome and congratulations, and to add that they will find the other members tolerant and friendly people.

Since I am speaking tonight on the amendment to the amendment, I believe I should read it. It reads as follows:

That the amendment be amended by inserting therein immediately after the words "Your Excellency's advisers" the following words: "have deliberately returned to the policy of uncontrolled and unplanned private enterprise which resulted in the depression and unemployment of the pre-war years, and that Your Excellency's advisers have failed to undertake the economic planning necessary to cope with the serious problems now facing the Canadian people, and".

The British people, Mr. Speaker, repudiated such a program a few years ago and have demonstrated that the policy they are now following has lifted them out of a desperate situation. It would be folly of the worst kind, I feel, for us to accept the suggestions in the amendment to the amendment put forward by the socialists in this house.

Now, referring to the speech from the throne itself, I personally feel that it is the greatest disappointment I have experienced in the 12 or 13 sessions I have attended. It is a record of history instead of a call to action. When labour, fiscal and trade problems are uppermost in the minds of most of our citizens I believe one may aptly say of the throne speech, "They asked for bread and received a stone." I just want to contrast that with President Eisenhower's state of the union message delivered a day or so ago. There was not a word of the past in it, but it was full of hope, work and direction for the future. This year the President was concerned with a world half slave and half free.

Just while I am dwelling on that I want to mention a name probably forgotten by many; that is Clarence Darrow. He said that he who admits of a changing world admits the theory of evolution. In spite of all our beliefs, we must admit that this is a changing world; no one can deny it. The fault I see with the throne speech and with the government is that they have hitched their trading and fiscal policies to an inflexible system or plan, supervised and ruled from outside our shores. This same government has made or tried to make a fetish of everything Canadian, and has severed every possible connection