

from what I said at that time. This will be found at page 37 of the *Hansard* of last session:

I think that we would all do well to remember that the Senate has not, traditionally, resisted the adoption of any piece of Government legislation for which a government has received a clear popular mandate, whether as the result of a general election or otherwise. Nor would it, in my view, be inclined to do so in future, in the absence of the most compelling reasons for believing that the issue should be referred once again to the electorate.

Then I asked permission to quote what the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen said when he occupied the position similar to the one I occupy at present. Here are his words:

Where there is a mandate for legislation which comes before the Senate; where such legislation was clearly discussed and placed on the platform of the successful party in an election, then only in most exceptional circumstances should there be any attempt or desire on the part of the Upper House to refuse to implement a mandate by its concurring imprimatur. No one, however, who has thought the subject out can say that under no circumstances should legislation coming to the Senate from the Commons, though clearly supported by a popular mandate in an election, fail of support in the Second Chamber. It has been plainly and tersely enunciated by Sir John Macdonald, by George Brown and by Maritime statesmen, as well as by Taché of Quebec, that the Senate's duty, or one of its duties, is to see not only that wise legislation, having for its purpose nothing but the public good, is allowed, irrespective of mandate, to become law, but in certain conceivable events to see to it as well that the public of Canada, which may at one election have endorsed extraordinary proposals, has opportunity, if such proposals are of a particularly dangerous or revolutionary character, to think the subject over again; in a word, that the Senate may, under certain circumstances, be allowed to appeal from the "electorate of yesterday" to the "electorate of tomorrow".

Honourable senators, may I also be permitted to read a quotation taken from a speech made on February 12, 1936, by the late Senator Dandurand.

The framers of the Confederation intended this chamber not to be a duplicate of the Commons . . . 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.

Honourable senators, that is the position which the Opposition takes at this time.

While on the question of legislation, I trust that the Leader of the Government will not, except in connection with interim supply bills and under the most unusual circumstances requiring urgent legislative action, ask us to give more than one reading to a bill at one sitting. Nor will he ask us to by-pass the committee stage of a bill. It is in the committee stage that the Senate can do its best work. There are those who

would prefer that bills should go to a Committee of the Whole House rather than to a standing committee. The great advantage in sending a bill to a standing committee is that the deputy minister and other departmental officials can be questioned directly by senators, whereas in Committee of the Whole the questions to the departmental officials must be asked through the leader or the senator who is in charge of the bill. I do not think this is as satisfactory as direct questions by senators to officials. That, however, is a matter which the senators must decide from time to time when a bill has received second reading. My point is that the committee stage should not be by-passed, but that we should be given an opportunity when sitting in committee to consider every bill which is presented to this house.

Now, honourable senators, may I, without going into great detail, briefly touch on three matters which are of great concern to all Canadians, and are three of the most important problems with which the ministry must be concerned. In fact, I know the Government is concerned about these matters.

In Canada today, in spite of the large number of our fellow citizens who are unemployed, we continue, generally speaking, to live in an era of general prosperity. I am not discussing the question of whether at the moment the number of unemployed is 825,000 or 516,000. True, there are a great many unemployed, but as I say, we are at the same time living in an era of general prosperity. In fact, we are becoming so reckless with our prosperity that the cost of living continues each month to set records in its rapid climb upward, and this in turn creates demands for increases in the price of all goods and services. In other words, we are caught in the midst of a dangerous inflationary spiral which, if carried to extremes, could not only stop our progress, but would give us such a setback that the high standard of living which we have attained would not be reached again for many decades.

We have seen what has happened in other countries where inflation has become rampant, and it would be even more serious in Canada, because we are a young country and need large amounts of foreign capital to develop our resources. This capital has been coming in in large amounts during the past ten years. Some think it has come in in too large amounts. I am not going to discuss that question at this time. I do say that if our progress is not to be retarded we must have large amounts of foreign capital to