

Hon. Mr. Euler: Are you not always looking for trouble?

Hon. Mr. Crerar: I am merely trying to make clear what the effect of the bill will be, so that we will know what we are voting for.

No one in Canada has greater faith in the supremacy of parliament than I have, but if the events of today are contrasted with those of fifty years ago, I do not think any student of affairs would deny that the executive power has been greatly increased. That is true in many countries, including Great Britain, where there has recently been criticism of it. Any increase in the power of the executive as against the power of parliament is not a healthy development. While parliament has the right to vote a government out of power, and to make any changes it may desire, there is sometimes a reluctance on the part of the majority to do so.

Honourable senators, that is my humble contribution to the debate on the bill before the house.

Some Hon. Senators: Question.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall the bill be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: With leave of the Senate, now.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the third time, and passed.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from Friday, September 8, consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's speech at the opening of the session and the motion of Hon. Mr. Dupuis for an Address in reply thereto.

Hon. R. B. Horner: Honourable senators, there is nothing unusual in my rising to take part in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is the one opportunity I have of speaking without fear of being called to order by the honourable senator from Leeds (Hon. Mr. Hardy), for I can talk about anything from the frost in Saskatchewan to the heat in Timbuktu.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: I have just come in.

Hon. Mr. McKeen: To get a lesson?

Hon. Mr. Horner: I first wish to compliment the mover (Hon. Mr. Dupuis) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Barbour) of the Address

in reply on the excellent job they did. I was amused at the gentle chiding which the honourable senator from Prince gave me for raising my voice. He referred to the inspiration which he got from the quiet manner in which the House of Commons discussed the railway strike and came to a settlement. Well, I deplore the quiet manner that pleased him. The honourable senator made reference in his speech to the charity of which the Bible speaks. I would remind him that the Good Book also refers to an occasion when loud voices were heard and when the Master, upon being asked to rebuke his disciples, replied that if these should hold their peace the very stones would cry out. I have no doubt that when the money changers were driven from the temple loud voices were heard also.

Honourable senators, I think there has been altogether too much criticism of my leader. It is not often that I feel that I should come to his defence.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Horner: I can think of no other house of parliament with a two-party system, which has a more helpful leader of the opposition than we have. If I were to criticize him at all it would be because he is too generous with his help and advice.

My leader in speaking of the cost of living said that I had opposed controls. Well, I do not like to say to my honourable friends, "I told you so"; but I opposed controls away back in 1940, when I predicted that what has happened would happen. At that time creamery butter was controlled at a price of 32 cents a pound to the consumer while cream was being subsidized to bring the producer's price up to 42 cents per pound of butterfat. What happened? The butter producer became discouraged by reason of the high cost of labour and other things, and got rid of his herd.

For two years now I have opposed certain controls and prohibitions, notwithstanding the fact that we desperately needed American dollars. To prevent a rise in the cost of living, and mainly for the benefit of the eastern provinces, for two solid years the western rancher was prohibited from selling his cattle abroad. I have complained before of this prohibition. There followed a packers' strike in Western Canada. It continued for a month during the normal season for the marketing of cattle. At this time cattle of a quality which was bringing 30 to 35 cents per pound just across the border were selling at 10 or 11 cents a pound in Western Canada. Some of the ranchers decided to withhold their cattle and attempt to winter them, because