

column of "Skilled Help Wanted," three columns of "Female Help Wanted," and half a column of "Farm Help Wanted". On the same day the *Toronto Star* carried 15 columns of "Male Help Wanted" and seven columns of "Female Help Wanted".

I think these figures indicate that there are many jobs available, but, unfortunately, too many of our unemployed Canadians have not the knowledge or ability to fill them. I understand that more and more effort is being made to train our young people in technical schools and institutes. This will take time, but it will, I am sure, eventually do much to help the unemployment situation.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the Senate and to reiterate what I have said on several occasions, that a lot of the criticism of the Senate which we read too often in some of our newspapers is very unfair. I have been in the Senate for more than 20 years, and I am proud of the careful way important measures are debated and analyzed by senators, not only in this chamber but in committees. It is quite wrong for any paper to say that the Senate has in its membership a number of "political hacks". I am certain in my own mind that I am not a political hack. I think I am a fairly intelligent man, and perhaps equally as capable as any man elected to the House of Commons of forming opinions on the important matters which come before Parliament. Furthermore, I say that all senators are quite as intelligent as I am, and most are more intelligent and much better speakers than I ever assumed to be.

These references to "political hacks" always annoy me. I have honour and respect for men who take an active part in politics and try to elect to Parliament men who support their party and the policies which that party advocates and which they believe will benefit the country. These men are not "political hacks": they are patriotic citizens. The men for whom I have little respect are those who tell you, with an assumed air of superiority, that they take no interest in politics. Some even have the gall to call it a "dirty game". Well, in my opinion politics is the basis of good government, and if the men who are appointed to the Senate by both the leading political parties in this country are those who have taken an active part in politics, then I say they are the ones most likely to deal intelligently with the subjects which come before it.

It is unfortunate that criticism of the Senate too often comes from newspapers which know little about the every day working of this honourable body. Being a newspaperman myself, I know that it costs money to maintain competent reporters in the press galleries

at all times. I know the newspaper business, and I realize many editors think that what is said and done by the elected representatives of the people in the House of Commons is more important than what is said and done in the Senate. That is the reason I suspect we see so few reporters in the Senate press gallery day by day.

I say emphatically, however, that I am sure no newspaper wishes to be unfair. It is simply that too few of them have an intimate knowledge of this honourable body and the work that is done here. I wish it were possible for some editors to spend a week observing the working of the Senate, both in this chamber and in committees.

We are told in the Speech from the Throne that a measure will be introduced to reform the Senate. I do not know all the details it will contain, but I hope it contains nothing that will force out of the Senate some of the very able senators who are now over 75 years of age, and who still speak with knowledge and ability—and I do not include myself. We all get older, and it may be that as we get older our ability is somewhat weakened; but that is not always the case. I remember that Sir Charles Tupper was Prime Minister of Canada at 75, and a brilliant man he was. I speak with authority, because I once heard him address a crowded armoury in the City of Brantford. After he was Prime Minister, he was Leader of the Opposition for some years, and did not retire from that position until 1900, when he was 79. Also we must not forget that William Ewart Gladstone was Prime Minister of Great Britain at 84. Furthermore, I have heard senators who are over 75 make speeches on important subjects in this chamber of which any cabinet minister in the other place might well be proud.

I am thinking particularly of a speech delivered before Christmas in this house by Senator Crerar, of Churchill, in which he defended the investment of American capital in Canada.

Honourable senators, I thank you for your kind attention to my rambling remarks, and I hope that many senators on both sides of the house will give us their views on the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Gunnar S. Thorvaldson: Honourable senators, having listened to the excellent speech just given by the honourable Senator Rupert Davies, I first want to congratulate him upon its excellence and the way in which he always addresses this house. He referred to what he termed his own deficiencies. I should like to say to Senator Davies that he is entirely too modest; and that no one in this house could agree with him in those particular remarks. Had my wife been listening to the honourable senator I know she