

installed on the east and west sides of the chamber and that some kind of booth would have to be built in. While that could be accomplished on the west side, because there is a corridor, it could not be done on the east side without finishing the corridor, which would then connect the stairway at the south end with the one at the north end. While we were dealing with that, the Department of Public Works came over here and tapped the wall behind where the pictures are now and they said that there would be no problem there, that you could knock it down in 24 hours because it was nothing but rubble. The reason that it is rubble is because originally the architect had in mind finishing the chamber with galleries on both sides, and therefore all you would have to do would be to knock the rubble out and build the roof out above, and you would then put your corridor on the east side. If you were to build on to the west side, of course, then you would lose the rooms now being used as offices, or practically all of them. That raised the question as to where you were going to put the staff then in them, and so on. This was discussed, but as you know, nothing has been done.

At every opening we have had cameras in there, and they have built platforms to take a very heavy weight of cameras and operators. The architects from the Department of Public Works said that that was a temporary arrangement, but that some day one of those cameras would tumble down and hit a senator, or perhaps a diplomat or a lieutenant governor, on the head and perhaps maim him—if not worse—and then we would probably get around to doing something about this. But, as I say, nothing has been done about that. Every time I go into the Senate Chamber to watch an Opening, I look down at those platforms and wonder when one of those big cameras is going to tumble down, because it would not take very much, since the platforms are very narrow, the cameras are very heavy and the platforms normally are crowded. Personally I would prefer not to sit too close to them.

The Chairman: Mr. MacNeill, do you mind if I interject? I think that while this point is really beyond the purview of our purpose, I am delighted that it has come up, and I am sure all other honourable senators are also, because we should remind ourselves, sometime before this committee dissolves, to have a discussion on problems like this. This is one thing that I feel we should take note of.

Mr. MacNeill: Well, I wanted to get that point in because we discussed it some time ago.

The Chairman: We certainly did not want to see any unnecessary provision of vacant seats in the Senate because of a camera falling from such a platform.

Mr. MacNeill: Yes, there are other ways of getting vacancies that are less objectionable!

I notice that Senator Fergusson is here. I wonder if she remembers the night when we had a lot of trouble trying to get the ice off the roof, and on this particular occasion the water started to come down and Senator Fergusson and Senator Inman had to move from their seats. We had been pleading with the Department of Public Works to repair the roof, and they had said that they would do it in the spring. We had pointed out that when the spring came the roof might not be there, because the ice was building up to such an extent and it was quite plain to see that a dangerous situation was developing. But they did nothing about it until this happened. It destroyed the mural and the panelling above the seats. It cost quite an amount of money to have that repaired. That small catastrophe only had the

effect of moving one or two senators down a couple of seats, but I should like to see something being done before a camera falls and hits somebody, even a more humble person than a senator.

When I first discussed this matter with Senator Connolly, he and I had what you might call a session or a seance, and I had certain ideas about what I thought might be worth talking about. Then just yesterday I had a discussion with Mr. Fortier on the telephone, and then I read the debate in the Senate on this matter. My understanding was that this committee was looking for a theme. I think that is the first thing that has to be decided: What is your theme? What are you going to put up there? Then it would be a question of getting the artist to see what could be done about it. It so happens that the April 9 is a date in my life which I will never forget because it was on the morning of April 9 that the Canadian Corps jumped off and before the end of that day had taken Vimy Ridge. I had the good fortune—and I did not quite think about it at the time—to play a part in that attack which in a sense was rather prominent because I was the first man to jump over the top in the attack at 5.30 that morning on our front. We were well trained and we knew what we were going after, but we did not know what was going to happen. So I got to thinking about Vimy and I thought about the beautiful monuments we have all over the country. This applies in other countries as well. If you go to Paris or to Westminster you find the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The theme in most of these cases is the sacrifice made by these men, which is symbolized in this building in the very beautiful chamber which we have in the tower, the Memorial Chamber, where the names of a great many of my friends are written. Occasionally I go up there and have a look at them. So I think it has been very well taken care of in this building, and I do not think we need any more than that. Then we have dealt with the provinces, or the divisions of this country in the very beautiful windows installed in the House of Commons which are more or less dedicated to that theme.

Then I thought about what Sir John A. Macdonald had in mind—and not only Sir John, but the Fathers of Confederation—when they set up this chamber. Sir John referred to it as “a chamber of sober second thought.” I am sure that at the time he set up this chamber the word “sober” was very important, but nowadays, with more enlightened thinking, perhaps we do not need that word to the same extent. But we do need second thought, and even there perhaps we do not need to talk about “second thought” as much as we do about “thought”. That brought me to thinking about another occasion, when I was in on the dedication of another building in this complex.

In 1936 the Justice Building was in the course of construction. It was originally intended to be a police building. Then, when the government changed, the minister of our department was Mr. Lapointe. I had the very good fortune to be in the deputy minister's office one day when the minister came in and said, “I am going down to that new building to have a look at it. I do not think we should fill it up with policemen.” Mr. Edwards agreed with this. Then the minister said, “I am going to walk down. Would you like to come with me?” Mr. Edwards said, “Well, what are you going to do?” I should point out that there were no elevators in the building. The minister said, “I am going to walk up and look at that third floor that they have set up so well.” Mr. Edwards was lame, of course, and he said, “I do not think that I can walk up there very well.” Then Mr. Edwards turned and said, “Here is someone who is young.