

The appearance of a lady sitting on the other side of the House is evidence of a happy appointment. I recall that towards the end of last session, as the then Prime Minister (Right Hon. Mr. Bennett) came with His Honour the Deputy Governor for the Royal Assent to Bills, I was sitting on the other side, having to my right the honourable senator from Rockcliffe (Hon. Mrs. Wilson) and to my left my right honourable friend from Eganville (Right Hon. Mr. Graham). As the Prime Minister passed by my seat I told him that he should take notice that we had society on our side. He smiled. Perhaps at the time he had the name of Mrs. Fallis in his mind; which would fully explain the smile.

I was happy to hear from my right honourable friend that he did not intend to play the role of leader of an opposition. That is similar to what I told him when he came into this Chamber. I remember his first word was—and I appreciated it as a high compliment—that I should be henceforth the opponent worthy of his steel. I told him that I disclaimed any such honour, and moreover would not be an opponent, because I did not recognize the existence of such an institution as His Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this Chamber. He seemed somewhat surprised, but I think that during the five sessions we have worked together he has come to realize that there is no systematic opposition here and that we are all bent upon doing our best to improve the legislation that comes to us from the House of Commons.

I may say that in 1922, on taking the leadership for the Government in this Chamber, I expressed the same opinion, pointing out that the framers of Confederation intended this Chamber not to be a duplicate of the Commons, and that if we felt and acted as though we were, our usefulness as a second Chamber would be gone. The Senate is not a duplicate of the House of Commons. We stand above the sharp divisions of party that exist in the other Chamber, and we approach all questions with a desire to do our best for the general interest of the country. I believe that I have been fairly consistent in upholding the underlying principle I then enunciated, both when acting as Government leader and when sitting where my right honourable friend is now sitting. While acting in either capacity I have shown, I think, very little bias. Of course I recognize that, as in the country, there are two trends of thought in this Chamber, but they do not express themselves here in as forcible a manner as in the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: We have imbibed certain principles and doctrines, which remain with us throughout our career, but when I step into this Chamber I feel that I should leave at the door all political prejudices and address myself simply to the merits of the questions that come before us for consideration.

My right honourable friend has asked for information concerning many of the statements that appear in the Speech from the Throne, and although I shall not deal with them in the order mentioned by him, I think I shall cover all he has brought to our attention.

The right honourable gentleman has spoken of that part of the Address which refers to the formation of a national commission to co-operate with the provinces and municipalities, the commission to be assisted by an advisory committee. He has not much faith in such commissions, and he has expressed his lack of faith in forcible terms. I would draw my right honourable friend's attention to the fact that this matter was submitted to the people of Canada during the last term of Parliament, both in the House and outside, and the people seem to have endorsed such a proposal. There is, I believe, some virtue in it. Heretofore there has been no co-ordination of effort on the part of the Dominion Government, the provinces and the municipalities. There has been no concerted action. We have been furnishing money by the millions to the various provinces without having a general view of the subject. My right honourable friend says, and quite properly, that Parliament should assume the obligation and perform the function of exercising a supervision over this expenditure, but Parliament can only do so through its own committees, and this brings us near to the organization of a separate commission.

I can well see that a national commission could study with benefit the distribution of the unemployed, who are gathered in most of our cities and towns. In Great Britain there is a constant movement to have us open our doors to immigrants from that country; and there is also a constant movement towards the colonization of our lands. But we find throughout this country a resistance to immigration, even though it be from the British Isles, because of the fear that it would increase the number of unemployed in Canada. I have been wondering, however, whether we should not do something, under some system such as would be adopted if people were coming from abroad, to place on the land the unemployed who are in our cities and towns. I have yet to be told that the hundreds of thousands of immigrants who