

million for the causeway at the Straits of Canso, and \$300 million or more for pensions to people over seventy. All this additional money will increase the demand for goods.

The other day the *Winnipeg Free Press* said, quite properly, that somebody must tell the people of Canada we cannot go on doing that kind of thing and continue to live in the same old way as in the past. Some people may say that senators have not much cause to complain, that we are in a fine position, that we are paid \$6,000 now instead of \$4,000, as we were when I was appointed here sixteen years ago. But of course, we are not really paid as well now as we were then, for the dollar is worth only about half as much today as it was in 1935.

I do not believe that the government have properly faced the problem at all, or that the means which they have suggested for dealing with it will be effective. I am told that the cost of living has not increased as rapidly since the budget was brought down as it did before; but we all know that it has increased.

Recently, in trying to find out what kind of things the people are interested in, I did a little figuring which may be of interest to the house. I analysed the results of the four federal by-elections that were held early this summer. Two of these elections were in a western province, and the others were in widely separated provinces. Every one of the elections went against the government, and I tried, without having regard to political considerations at all, to find the underlying reason for this. I may have reached a wrong conclusion, and I may be criticized by some of my friends for expressing it; but I say to you quite candidly that I do not think the people intended to vote against the government as a government, but against their failure to deal with the problem of the high cost of living. To avoid a misstatement on this point, I should perhaps break the rule again and read from my manuscript.

I am going to refer now particularly to the by-election in Queens, Prince Edward Island, a constituency with which I am not very familiar. Angus MacLean, who was the successful candidate in the by-election, received a majority of 453 votes. He and his opponent both had been candidates in the preceding general election. As is usual, the same number of votes was not polled by each candidate in both elections. In the general election MacLean received 476 more votes than he got in the by-election; and Miller, the defeated candidate in the by-election, received 655 fewer votes than he got in the general election. It would appear to me that the question of the cost of living must have been the reason for the change. The facts and

figures I have given apply to the same constituency and to the same two candidates.

I come now to the constituency of Waterloo South. There the successful candidate in the by-election was of the same party as was the member elected in the general election, but in the by-election he polled over 200 more votes than the candidate for his party had polled in the general election. I may say that as far as popularity was concerned the two men were about equal. I know that constituencies vary, and that local conditions influence by-elections, but this illustration applies to a constituency in which the candidate of the party that was successful on both occasions—the Progressive Conservative party—gained some 200 votes in the by-election. The C.C.F. candidate increased her vote in the by-election by some 200 votes, notwithstanding the fact that there were fewer total votes polled. It is notable that the government candidate dropped nearly 1,900 votes in the by-election. It is impossible for me to come to any other conclusion on these facts than that this was a demonstration of criticism of the government because of its failure to solve the problem of the high cost of living.

I come now to a constituency closer to home, that of Winnipeg South Centre, where an amusing phenomenon occurred in the results of the total votes cast. In the by-election the Progressive Conservative candidate polled 584 fewer votes than he did in the general election; the Liberal received 9,574 fewer votes than the Liberal candidate received in the general election, and the C.C.F. candidate polled 3,235 fewer votes than were polled by the candidate for that party in the general election. The net result was that the Progressive Conservative candidate was elected by majority of 736 votes. Knowing that seat very well, and having lived there for nearly thirty-eight years of my life, I would say that apart from some incidents that may have influenced the voting, the basic problem was the cost of living. Although there were fewer votes polled in the by-election, it is quite plain that the Liberal voters—leaving out personalities—stayed at home. While they would not vote against their candidate, they would not vote for him. I repeat that the problem that influenced the voting as much as 95 per cent was the cost of living, and the result indicates that the people were determined that not only the government, but the Parliament of Canada, should know of their attitude on the subject.

I come now to the constituency of Brandon, where in the general election the government candidate was a citizen of the town and the opposition candidate was an outsider. The candidate who represented Labour