

sure he could not have been serious in this remark, for as a very able man he knows that this is not so.

Never in the history of Canada has there ever been a more constant drive to create employment than we have seen in recent years: the massive winter works program, the most ambitious housing construction program in our history, money pumped into the economy through the Industrial Development Bank, small business loans, and so on. A crash program for vocational training that we should have had 20 years ago was undertaken, grants to the provinces were doubled, large subsidies were provided to shipbuilding, special help was given to municipalities, to the Atlantic provinces and the west. It would take a long time, honourable senators, just to list the measures taken to prime the economy.

Look at the present picture in employment. Since the first quarter of 1961 employment has been rising steadily. Total employment in 1961 averaged 94,000 higher than in 1960. But in the first eight months of 1962 employment was 197,000 higher on the average than in the corresponding period of 1961.

During the summer months a record of 268,000 young people entered the labour market. But in spite of this, total unemployment in August was estimated at 280,000, some 43,000 lower than a year earlier. In my opinion these figures speak for themselves.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald, Brantford) supported our drive to increase our exports. However, I have wondered if he misunderstood the situation when he stated that "manufactured articles of any kind come thirteenth among our exports".

Honourable senators will recall that the honourable Leader of the Opposition made the same mistake last January in his address on the Throne Speech. At that time he proffered a list of our principal exports in 1960. If he will examine the list closely he will note that many of the top items are manufactured products. The honourable senator from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) may not agree with this. I mentioned pulp and paper the other day. The biggest item of all, newsprint paper, is, in my opinion, fully manufactured. It is a manufactured article. It has been Canada's greatest export for a number of years. I think it amounted to over three-quarters of a billion dollars last year and it is running very close to a billion now.

Lumber is surely a semi-manufactured product. We do not take lumber and build houses and factories in Canada and ship them to other parts of the world. We ship our product, lumber, which is a manufactured product. Wood pulp requires only one more

process to become paper. Aluminum is manufactured from bauxite which is imported to Canada from the West Indies and other parts of the world. Surely it cannot be called a non-manufactured article. The reference to semi-fabricated products such as aluminum, nickel and copper could be misleading. These items are exported in a form far from the ingot stage. In most cases only one step more is required before they reach the hands of the final consumer.

All these articles which I have mentioned supersede farm implements and farm machinery in the list which was produced by the Leader of the Opposition.

Of course 1961 was a year of further important strides in final manufacturing in Canada. For example, motor vehicle production rose by 29.8 per cent. This is a trend that we are all pleased to note and is a result of continuing efforts by the Prime Minister and the Government in this regard.

I agree entirely with the Leader of the Opposition, that we must increase our manufacturing along all lines, and Canada is particularly suited to certain manufactures. We are suited particularly, of course, to the manufacture of pulp and paper, to the processing of our minerals, lumber and other products. This we are doing, while we maintain them at a high standard. As I say, I agree entirely with the Leader of the Opposition: let us try to develop these other industries. I contend that the Government is doing this in every way possible, and it has a very good blueprint in the Speech from the Throne for continuing to do so.

The Leader of the Opposition devoted a large portion of his remarks to the position of the Senate when the House of Commons is led by a minority Government. "The mandate of the Senate", he called it.

I quote from his remarks in the *Debates of the Senate*, at page 39:

We must, as a responsible second chamber, take the general attitude that no piece of government legislation which might come before us in the current session could be said to have behind it a clear popular mandate. Therefore, it will be necessary for us in each case, to give all legislation ever more searching investigation than has been our custom following a conclusive popular verdict.

This is an argument for which the Leader of the Opposition will find little support either in this chamber or in the nation. He will no doubt appreciate that it makes no difference by whom a bill is introduced in the other place. If it receives a majority vote there it then comes to us as a measure endorsed by the elected representatives of the people of