

in the past. As to the leader opposite, I hope he will continue to perform his duty as critic as he has up till now, that is, in a constructive manner.

I cannot fail to mention the loss of one of our good friends, the late Senator Fogo. He passed away at an early age and very suddenly. His loss is perhaps more deeply felt by me than by many others, because he was my neighbour in this chamber. I was aware of his knowledge and consulted him often in order to get a better understanding of certain points of law which a layman sometimes has difficulty in grasping. I wish to extend to his family my most sincere and deepest sympathy.

I am happy to greet my colleagues who return invigorated to take up anew the task of working harder than ever for a great cause: the advancement, the greatness and the prosperity of our country.

With reference to the speech from the throne, which affords me the honour of being among the first to be called to speak in this new session, I shall not attempt to analyse in detail every subject mentioned therein. I shall comment on certain points which are connected therewith directly or indirectly. My speech will bear rather on principles. It is sometimes said of speeches made in reply to the speech from the throne that they are gone with the wind. Nevertheless, if the remarks inspired by it could do no more than awaken some ideas that may bear fruit in a year or two, the time spent in making them would not be lost. I believe such remarks are necessary and that the authorities sometimes pay attention to them.

One of the greatest concerns of every citizen is taxation. Some claim that it is so heavy, and the cost of living is so high, that they can no longer buy what they need. Others maintain that expenditures are excessive, or else that social security legislation is too costly, or else that defence expenditures should not be so great.

On the other hand, some people would like the government to spend more money for defence preparation; they feel that we have not gone far enough in that direction. Others claim that social security legislation is not adequate; that old age pensions should be increased to sixty dollars a month, that family allowances might be more generous, as well as pensions to the blind, to war veterans, etc. If they are placed in power, they say, they will give more and tax less. By what means would they work out such a miracle? To spend more and tax less! Let those understand who can. Finally, others believe that in printing more paper money all expendi-

tures could be paid without any burden being placed upon the taxpayer. Such a system was tried out in France once upon a time, when the government issued *assignats*. After a few months' trial the whole economy of the country collapsed completely, which was one of the causes of the revolution. How can the mere fact of printing on a piece of paper the figures \$1, \$2 or \$20 give any value to such money?

Another means which is often suggested to the government is to borrow. Indeed, I read in a newspaper a few days ago: "Why not decrease taxation and borrow money—borrow a billion a year, for instance". People seem to believe that when you borrow there is no obligation to repay or to pay interest. Are they aware that when borrowing at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  or 4 per cent, in a very few years the capital is doubled simply because of the interest? If we should resort to such steps, future generations would be in debt for many decades.

Not that all capital expenditures should be paid for from one year to the next, but as far as social security expenditures are concerned, it seems to me that, from an economic point of view, they should be paid each year.

It is also said: "Why spend so much on defence?" But when the war broke out in 1939, how many of our people reproached England and France for not having prepared themselves. Some cannot see why we in Canada should spend our money uselessly, when there is no immediate danger of being attacked. Germany had armed herself, had prepared for war, but we had done nothing or very nearly. Let us read Churchill's Memoirs. The war lasted five years and caused an orgy of expenditure and slaughter. Today, we see what the communists are doing, what they are preparing, what they are striving for. Let us not close our eyes: they are going through the very same gestures as Hitler did, with this difference, that Stalin has a genius for evil, while Hitler was unbalanced. But people do not seem to realize what harm would befall our country if we failed to take immediately the means to protect ourselves, to defend our country, and to show our opponents the strength which would be at our disposal and which we could use against them.

A few years ago, in a little village that I know very well, some progressive aldermen wanted to set up a fire protection system. But the village people protested: "Why make such an expenditure? There has never been a conflagration in our village; it was never burned down". But one fine day,