when an attempt is made to discuss these all-important questions. We are not going to be deterred at all from discussing them and bringing them into the light of parliamentary debate by the threadbare argument that this would be giving some comfort to the Russians, or that it was almost unpatriotic—practically traitorous—to talk about some of these matters. I hope that before this debate closes we shall get from the Minister of Finance, both in attitude and in frankness, something very different from what we have witnessed recently when matters of this kind have been before us.

I have observed that it has been the minister's custom to sit in his seat and shout across the floor such terms as "rubbish", "nonsense", "improper", "irresponsible" and so on. Then before the debate closes we hear nothing further from the hon. gentleman. I hope he will speak with greater candour in the course of this debate with regard to these all important matters. This shyness on the part of the Minister of Finance is something new. He never used to be shy in discussing matters of this kind, and I can easily give an illustration or two in support of what I am saying. For example, on March 27, 1956, as reported in *Hansard* on page 2648, this is what he had to say:

> Every time the bank rate was raised, it had the effect of subtracting millions of dollars from the value of the bonds held by Canadians, including dominion government bonds.

We found no shyness or lack of statements from the government when interest rates appeared to be going in another direction. I recall that on January 27, 1958, as reported on page 3852 of *Hansard*, the finance minister did not think it was improper to say something about government policy in a matter of this kind. These are his words: "The tight money policy has now been eased in line with the policies of this government." He was referring to municipalities, and so on. The Prime Minister had earlier met the premiers of the provinces—on November 25, 1957—and again, at this conference, he had no timidity about discussing a matter of this sort. He said: "Here in Canada, quietly and gradually over the last three months, the tight money situation has been eased." And he added:

> Those whose business it is to follow the bond market will have noticed it, and that includes many of you here, but it has not attracted such attention as one would think it has merited.

I could give innumerable quotations of this kind. The Minister of Finance during the election campaign was listing the elements of the Conservative inheritance which had been left them by the Liberals, and one of them, he said, was that interests rates were at the highest point in the generation. Credit was stifled, he said, by a tight money policy. Then he went on to say:

> Money is now more plentiful. Credit and interest rates have been reduced very substantially.

I draw to the attention of the minister that the rate for treasury bills one day after the budget was 4.42 per cent. A week before it was 4.33 per cent, and the week before that it was again 4.22 per cent. The all-time high, previously, was 4.08 per cent —the rate about which he had been complaining—and I suggest we are entitled to have some further authoritative statement from the ministry with respect to the government's intentions in matters of this kind, because when interest rates were going down, hon. gentlemen on the other side did not hesitate to say it was a result of government policy. The governor of the Bank of Canada, at page 3 of his recent report, said this:

> I believe that these fears of inflation will prove to have been exaggerated, particularly if appropriate steps may be expected to be taken to overcome government deficits.

The minister told us in his budget speech that he is not unduly apprehensive, or rather that he has no expectation of substantial increases in the cost of living in the course of the next year or two. If the minister and the governor do take this view I think the Minister of Finance should be able to tell us just why there is such a tight money rein at the moment. We know it is stifling capital investment and that the resort to the United States market is unduly high, particularly on the part of junior governments. And I am sure that the Minister of Finance did not miss the complaint of the chairman of the metropolitan area in Toronto, Mr. Gardiner, who is no normal critic of the present government but who felt obliged to complain and squeal with respect to the federal government's policies in this sphere of interest rates.

Mr. Stinson: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member leaves this subject, would he permit a question?

Mr. Benidickson: Surely.

Mr. Stinson: Would the hon. member not agree that the conversion loan was a good thing for Canada?

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has simply drawn me to the next subject with which I propose to deal. We did not have an opportunity to deal with any authoritative information on the matter of the conversion loan when the house adjourned last session. The Minister of Finance at that time was not prepared or was not able perhaps to give us very much information with