

The Address—Mr. Low

main highways of the United States are paid for by the federal government and the states and municipalities receive federal grants for state and county roads. All we are told is that some of the provinces which already have relief payments to make should get along with the building of the trans-Canada highway. I hope they will. I think in my own province they have gone further with the trans-Canada highway than most of the other provinces, but in any event that seems to be a very small amount of work in relation to what has to be done in this country.

I am very glad to see we are going to do something about the elimination of grade crossings. Many of us suggested that during the days of the depression, and if it had been done in a big way—although we do not know if it is now going to be done in a big way—many hundreds of lives would have been saved. However, I want to say that a substantial appropriation to assist the grade crossing fund will receive the wholehearted support of this party.

I do not propose to belabour these points but I should like to emphasize that throughout the autumn labour organizations, the mayors of municipalities, and social workers pointed out that unemployment was once again upon us and that steps should be taken to provide ways and means of enabling Canada to do what the Prime Minister said it was the responsibility of the government to do, namely provide everybody with the opportunity of taking jobs, even though the jobs were not always to their liking, so they could earn a decent living.

The unemployment insurance fund is a palliative, but even men who are entitled to relief from that fund wish they did not have to accept it. They do not like taking anything of that sort if they can avoid it. Consequently I say that the warnings given to the government throughout the autumn should have been heeded and parliament should have been recalled to discuss this problem. It is primarily a federal responsibility and the situation today is largely due to federal inaction.

I therefore think hon. members have no option but to vote for an amendment expressing lack of confidence in the government. Of course the present amendment is not altogether satisfactory to us because it says so much that we cannot quite understand, but at least we do understand most of the clauses and we are, in the main, in agreement with them.

However, I think we need something inserted which will give more punch to this and put the situation more constructively

before the house and the country. I am therefore going to move that the amendment be amended. I am sorry that, in doing this, I am obliged to put more words into it. Under the rules of the house I cannot do what I wanted to do and suggested I should do until I was advised that I could not do it, namely strike out most of it and substitute something fresh. Apparently we are not allowed to do that, so I must use some more words. I therefore move:

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"

I am not going to read it all to show how those words would fit in. I am just going to read the first sentence:

We regret that Your Excellency's advisers—

Then insert the amending words—

—have failed to take or to recommend the necessary measures . . .

—and so on. With that I leave the matter before the house. As I say, some other matters of great interest will be the subject of discussion, and we shall take the opportunity of expressing our views at those times. In the meantime I regret indeed that parliament has met in January instead of in November. I may say that I came back from overseas because I thought parliament was meeting about November 8 or 9. I arrived back on November 9 because I thought that parliament would be meeting. I am not sorry I did so because, I may say, I had the opportunity afterward of going to the meetings of the United Nations Organization. I greatly appreciated the opportunity, and found the meetings exceedingly interesting this year.

Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, it is presumed that I am now speaking to the subamendment. If what Your Honour said about the amendment introduced by the Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rowe) was true, then I suppose it would also be true to say that the subamendment has greatly complicated an already highly complicated amendment. I suppose it is a good thing that the rules of the house forbid the introduction of a third amendment. That being the case, I think perhaps I had better give both the subamendment and the amendment some careful study before committing myself with respect to them because I am frank to admit that it is difficult, without some careful study, to know what they