

tion does demand utmost attention to duty on our part, especially at this late hour in the session.

While I am on my feet, may I say that this demand that Government measures be defeated is made probably without calculation of the strength of those on this side of the House. Certainly, with defections we could defeat nothing. For those I am not responsible. But on account of the absence of one senator on military service, and of others, not less than four, all on this side, wholly incapable of attending because of illness, we no longer have a majority here. It may be well sometimes to consider simple arithmetic, even in these complicated days.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I do not know to what extent I should follow my right honourable friend in discussing the effect of our actions on the public. It is very hard to estimate the judgment of public opinion on what is done by either House of Parliament. When someone differs strongly with the Government concerning a certain measure he naturally expects to obtain support for his views in one of the two Chambers. I recall comments from divers sources that were not always laudatory with respect to actions of the Senate. Occasionally an editor of a newspaper remarks that something done by the Commons or the Senate has "outraged public opinion." Though that article is written by one man, yet he presumes to speak for all the people of Canada. It is not the first time I have heard of such an extravagant presumption. Honourable senators are familiar with the story of the three tailors of Tooley street who addressed a petition to the British House of Commons beginning, "We, the people of England." It is most amusing at times to see an article stating that outraged public opinion resents a certain action of the Senate or the Commons. Often, if the writer's name were at the bottom of the article, his readers would be unable to restrain a smile. Unsigned articles in newspapers carry considerable weight because of the reputation of the men directing the opinions and policy of those newspapers. Once or twice it was feared that the London Times might lose influence when directors of outstanding political acumen and unquestioned integrity departed from this life and were succeeded by men of less repute. Undoubtedly it is the reputation of the man directing the policy of a newspaper that gives authority to its editorials. The ownership of newspapers changes hands. In the present case we have the Montreal Gazette editorially censuring the Senate and warning us that our failure to heed the editor's views has "outraged

public opinion." Well, it suffices to say that were the article signed "John Bassett," it would bring a broad smile from every reader of the Montreal Gazette.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable members, as a junior senator in such distinguished company as that of the two leaders of the House, I may be permitted to say a word. At this very moment I have in my room a copy of one of the leading newspapers of Western Canada, containing an article criticizing this Chamber because we made certain amendments to the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Bill. It goes on to suggest that the leader on this side of the House and his majority—which it says he has—will be able to put the Unemployment Insurance Bill to sleep in the committee or to chloroform it in some way. When I was a member of an elective body I was criticized, as many others are, for being partisan and speaking on behalf of party, but I have always understood that in the Senate men and women could express their opinions freely if they wished. True, there are caucuses, and I have had the pleasure of attending some of them, but I have never been asked to follow the caucus either for or against a measure. I do not know how members are to act if they are not allowed to vote as they think best. On the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Bill I voted as I thought best for the interests of the people of Canada, and I very strongly resent the attack of the Montreal Gazette at this time. It is true that its view is contrary to mine, and it may be right; but the senators here come from and represent different parts of Canada, and they have a right to express their opinions as to what is best for the country. I say that in the matter of the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Bill we were not playing politics, and I was not playing politics so far as the Unemployment Insurance Bill was concerned. Therefore I resent the criticism directed at us by the Press of Canada simply because we happen to hold ideas which differ from their own. They have a perfect right to hold a particular view, but they should not attack others who do not agree with them.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot understand the honourable senator from Winnipeg South-Centre (Hon. Mr. Haig) at this hour resenting anything in the Manitoba Free Press, which has its root in the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act. I do not know whether the honourable gentleman was in the House or not—if he was not, he should