

Canada. The fact that it was sponsored by a minority government gives no cause to consider it any differently than we would a measure introduced by the strongest of governments.

The Leader of the Opposition calls the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen as his witness in support of this new constitutional principle he proposes. He quotes a speech of Mr. Meighen's which I find was delivered in 1937 by that eminent gentleman to the Canadian Club in Montreal. I might say from the paragraph he mentioned I can find nothing to support his argument.

If he will read further from that address—I have seen it, and an eloquent address it was—he will find that Arthur Meighen made the following convincing argument:

The great mass of legislation has, however, no relation to any special dictum of the people in an electoral contest at all. The great mass of legislation springs from circumstances of the hour. Something has to be done, in the judgment of the administration, and the administration works out its solution in such a manner as it deems fit, and submits that solution to Parliament. There is no question of a mandate at all in the case of at least 98 per cent of the measures which come to either house.

Note, "98 per cent"—practically all.

If it is a subject naturally within the purview of Government, something to do with administration; if it is a reflection in a bill of what the Government should be and feels itself best suited to handle, and if it does not affect positive principle going to the root of our institution, then I would say that even though it was thought a better way might be devised, even though it was thought that on a balance of merits the bill failed, it would be wiser for the Senate, if it can, after making such remedial amendments as will improve the measure, to allow the Government to have its way.

That is the witness the honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned the other day in support of his argument.

I would also like to refer him to a recent editorial in the *Ottawa Citizen*. Similar editorials have appeared in the press across the country, but I quote from the *Citizen*:

Senator Macdonald argues that the Government has no clear mandate from the people, having been rejected by a majority of the electorate. This is a weak argument.

I have known the *Ottawa Citizen* for 25 years, and it has never been a strong supporter of the Conservative party. The editorial continues:

And the Senate has no mandate at all. Whatever the original intention in establishing the second chamber, whatever the views of the first Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, that the Senate had the duty of taking a sober second look at government legislation, for all practical purposes the Senate is not a legislative body.

The argument that the Government has no clear mandate holds little force. As Senator Macdonald is no doubt aware, under the parliamentary system a Government does not draw its authority from the people, but from Parliament. As long as the House of Commons supports a government it has a mandate.

The Senate should, as Sir John A. Macdonald suggested, take a "sober second look" at all legislation. That is good advice, no matter what legislation it is. However, I hope that in the other place they will take a sober first look at all legislation and not agree to defeat it out of hand. If that is done fairly I think we shall all find that the program as set out in the Speech from the Throne contains the answer to the many problems we have at present.

The election campaign is over. The people of Canada, I am sure, expect us to realize that and get down to the work of the nation. That is what the Members of Parliament are here for at the present time. It is not by calling for motions of want of confidence that the affairs of this country are going to be attended to. If an election must come, let it come in due time. Until then, let us do the nation's business that we were sent here to attend to.

In conclusion, honourable senators, we are launched upon a decade of change, challenge and conflict. Every nation in the world, including our own, is faced with difficult adjustments. The prime responsibility of parliaments everywhere is to make citizens aware of the necessity of adapting to rapidly-changing situations, to provide the leadership that boldly faces the international facts of life and accommodates as circumstances require. Flexibility is a vital ingredient of stability. Realistic perspective, open-minded appraisal of the untried, bold acceptance of legitimate risk, readiness to seek out reasonable compromises between yesterday and tomorrow—these are the touchstones of the years ahead. I am sure that young, robust Canada will not falter or hesitate to pick up this gauntlet. Our nation is healthy, strong, vital. At its back lie resources of mine, forest,