

be called to deal with unemployment. That promise was an element in the election contest. It was made by the leader of the Opposition, was taken into consideration by the electorate of Canada, and was endorsed by them as one of the major policies of the Liberal-Conservative Party. That is why this session of Parliament has been called.

Now the Government has introduced three Bills for the relief of unemployment. Two of those Bills have been passed in another place and are now in process of consideration by this House. These Bills embody the policy and implement the promises of the Prime Minister as set out by him during the election campaign.

There is the situation we have to envisage now. What should we do to meet that situation in a common-sense, non-partisan way? We have experience and ability on both sides of this House. I doubt that there ever was in the Senate a more representative or more practical body of legislators than is found here to-day. I cannot count on the fingers of both hands the honourable members who have had long experience in political administration. The Bills which are to come before us are the outcome of the recent election and we in this House should take cognizance of what the people have asked to have done. Should we reject the measures? I have noted some expressions of opinion entirely in disagreement with the principle of the present Bill. Every honourable member has the privilege to agree or to disagree with any proposal brought before the House, but I take it that it is the consensus of opinion on both sides of the Chamber that we are not here to reject the measures that the Government is sending to us at this session. To reject these Bills would be to reject the instructions of the electorate, who gave full power to the present Government for the inauguration and carrying out of its policy with respect to unemployment. If we decide not to reject this Bill, should we amend it? If honourable members are considering an amendment, should they not ask themselves what good would come of any change proposed by this Chamber? The Government having put before us certain measures, the party in opposition to the Government has discussed those measures in caucus and in another place and devised such amendments as seemed to it to be feasible and reasonable, and its proposed amendments have been presented to the other Chamber and rejected by a large majority.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Not all.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Thirty-eight in one case and fifty-two in the other, I think.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Not all of them.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: No; one Bill is still under discussion in another place, but the Bill that we are at present considering has been passed there.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But the next Bill on our Order Paper was amended in another place.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: That Bill was passed there.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But it was amended in another place.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Well, it comes to us with whatever amendment was agreed upon there, as the consensus of opinion of both the Government and the Opposition in the other House; it comes to us in such a form that I do not think we can improve it. But even if we did make amendments, should we have any reasonable ground for supposing that the other House would accept them, after rejecting amendments which the Opposition in the other place considered feasible and salutary? It seems to me that nothing would be gained by our attempting to send these measures back to the other House with amendments.

I think, honourable senators, that there is only one sensible course for us to pursue, and that is to pass the measures and to hold the Government absolutely responsible for the way in which they are put into effect. The Government will have to meet Parliament again, and in both Chambers there will be a full opportunity for a review of its administrative acts.

A demand has been made as to the application to this measure of a rule which I think should always in ordinary circumstances be strictly followed, namely, that Parliament should be given complete and definite details of the measures of relief that it is intended shall be undertaken. Would it be practicable to follow that suggestion in the present instance? In order to safeguard the expenditure of public money it is ordinarily essential that Parliament should be furnished with details of the sums to be spent. Another safeguard is the audit by the proper officials of all expenditures. These conditions, it seems to me, ensure fairly safe administration of public money. But to my mind it seems clear that we cannot at this time rigidly apply these two safeguards in connection with this appro-