

The Address—Mr. Hansell

asked him to produce his gun he said: You surely do not think I did that with a gun. The police asked: What did you do it with? I do not know what he produced, but what he actually did it with was the government's financial policy. That is exactly what happened.

That is an allegory. I am quite certain that if the incident I have described actually happened, the people would be up in arms. Yet in effect that is what has happened. That is what happens to any person who goes to the bank today and takes out \$1,000 of the hard-earned savings he has put in there over the years. When he comes to spend it on the production of this country with all its wealth, he finds that he has only \$500. I could pursue that little allegory a bit further. Perhaps I shall.

Mr. Byrne: It might be worth while if it had some sense to it.

Mr. Hansell: I will give you some sense if you do not think that is sense. Somebody asked the old lady how it felt to be held up. She said: I did not feel it a bit. He was such a nice man, and he had such a nice, shiny gun. In fact, I told him, she said, that I would be back in a week or two for another thousand, and if he was around I would not mind much if he did the same thing again. The hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) suggested that I might illustrate the point with some sense. He might say: The last part of your illustration surely is nonsense. But let me tell him that it is no more nonsense than it will be for a bunch of chumps to turn around in the next election and vote Liberal. It will take a little while for that statement's meaning to dawn on the mind of my hon. friend; but eventually he will get it.

An hon. Member: It is very deep.

Mr. Hansell: The fact of the matter is this. I say again that the result of the financial policy that has been pursued by the present government is the situation we have today, and they cannot escape responsibility.

We need to speed up the wheels of our vast productive system. We need to put on the market more consumer goods. I know, of course, what the government will say to that suggestion. They will say: But you must recognize the fact that a great deal of our productive machinery today is being put into the production of non-consumer goods; the world is on the edge of a volcano; we have joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and we are spending money on our defences. I realize that fact. We all realize it. We all like to be as sensible as we can be. But let me ask one question. Suppose, for instance, we

[Mr. Hansell.]

should be greatly surprised one of these days to find that we had come into an era of peace, when the confidence and trust between nations should suddenly be restored and there were no danger of an international armed conflict. I should like to know how the government would handle the situation if the wheels of our productive system should suddenly be changed over to the production of consumer goods. Would they shy away from a possible problem of unemployment? In what way would they change the framework of their monetary system in order to cope with a situation of that kind? That is something they have never answered, and something that men in public life should know. It is something that the people of Canada should know. It is something I will dare them to answer. Their financial policy would not be able to take care of a situation of that kind. I declare on that score that the government has absolutely no answer.

The other matter that I should like to refer to is the subamendment, which in reality is now under discussion. It was moved by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch)—I think it was well moved and well timed. I will read it for the record:

That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following words:

Furthermore, we regret that Your Excellency's advisers have failed to compensate the recipients of war veterans allowance for the increase in the cost of living by an appropriate increase in the amount of the allowance.

Previous to this I had intended to speak on the Legion's brief respecting an increase in their pensions. The other day we were delighted to hear the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Lapointe) announce that there would be an increase in war veterans' pensions. This has been mentioned before; it will bear mentioning again. Why did the government decide to increase the veterans' pensions, when no mention was made of it in the speech from the throne a few weeks ago? Could it be that pressure was brought to bear upon them to do it at this particular time, or could it be that an election was in the offing and they wanted to tell the people how much they thought of them? If the latter statement is correct, it may conceivably be found that they desired to assist Liberal Walter Thomson in his election. At least they got their answer, if they were willing to gamble millions of dollars for political purposes.

Mr. Cardiff: They assisted him out.

Mr. Hansell: However, I am saying this—and I want to be fair. We have reason to be pleased with the announcement. Our only regret is—and this has been mentioned before—that the government were not able, or did not see themselves able, to give similar