

The honourable member from Shelburne (Hon. Mr. Robertson) pointed out that he was appointed to the house in 1943 and that he is now No. 43 on the list of seniority. That is to say, of the ninety-six members who were living when he was appointed, fifty-three have passed on in the short course of eight years, and their places have been filled by new appointments. When one considers the mortality which strikes the members of this house, and which hangs over the heads of all people, particularly citizens of our age, one wonders whether the current of new opinion has not in these few years been almost a gale. I was summoned to the Senate in 1945, and am now fifty-seventh on the list. That is to say, forty-seven senators who occupied a place in this chamber in 1945 have passed on to their reward. In addition to that, the six new members from Newfoundland, and also those who took their seats after I took mine and who are no longer here, should be taken into account. The honourable senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) told us yesterday that he had been in the house for fifteen years, and is now eighteenth on the list. Although he is still a young man, within his time in this chamber practically the entire membership has changed. Surely, when one considers the mortality that carries off our members, there are enough new appointments to satisfy anybody.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: The Angel of Death has surely been generous enough in bringing about new appointments, without our joining in and borrowing his scythe. Let us hear no more about retirements of the kind suggested by the honourable senator.

I come now to the proposal that an age limit of seventy-five years be applied, not to the present holders of seats—for like the honourable member for Shelburne, we all have birthdays—but to new appointees who come to the house after us.

There are three great principles observed in drafting Acts of Parliament: They are, first, What is the evil to be corrected? second, What are the means to be adopted? and third, What are the results to be obtained? If we were drafting a statute for the purpose of applying an age limit in this way, I would ask honourable senators, What is the evil to be corrected? Has anyone in this chamber the hardihood to suggest that the Senate would be improved now by dropping out honourable members who have attained the age of seventy-five years and replacing them with younger men? And if not now, why in the future? Are we not to judge the future by the present? If honourable gentlemen over the age of seventy-five who are now among us are to remain, what are the arguments

that would justify a different treatment of those who will be seventy-five in the years to come? I know that personalities should usually be kept out of our debates, but I think I am justified in making an exception in this instance. Is there anybody in this house, is there anyone in Canada who would deny Sir Allen Aylesworth the joy he has in occupying a position in this chamber? Not a soul.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Would anyone argue for a moment that our deliberations would be bettered, our judgment improved, or any other worthy object accomplished by dropping him from the membership of this house? May I express the wish that he will live to one hundred and fifty: may he long live to enjoy the honours and responsibilities which, as a respected and revered member of this house, are now his.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: My honourable friend from Ponteix (Hon. Mr. Marcotte) points out that the late Senator Dandurand lived to the age of eighty-two. The leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), in his masterly address yesterday, cited the instance of Mr. Gladstone, who carried on his Midlothian campaign when he was over eighty. His wonderful speeches, long, detailed and masterly, were published in book form. I have read a number of them.

Hon. Mr. Haig: He was Prime Minister for the fourth time at the age of eighty-three.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: I know that he was over eighty when he made his Midlothian campaign. It has been said that Supreme Court Judges retire at seventy-five. But, I submit, honourable senators, there is no analogy between a member of the Supreme Court bench and a member of the Senate. The task of sitting day after day listening for hours to legal arguments, or to contests on the floor of a court, and then of writing judgments, with all the care and responsibility they entail, is an arduous one. Many a young man has broken down under the strain of this exacting work. There is no such pressure upon the senators of Canada. What is required of us is good judgment, experience, knowledge, understanding and integrity, rather than quantity production. It is what we do, and the wisdom and judgment that we throw into it; not how much we do, not the number of hours we devote to it, not the amount of slugging or that kind of exertion that we put in. The people of Canada are not interested in how long we work, but in what we do, how we do it, and how well we protect their interests; and I believe that,