

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

forward with an even more drastic reform regarding the Senate.

What are we to take from this situation? Charles Lynch put it very amusingly last Friday in his column in the *Ottawa Citizen* in this way; under the heading "No rocking of the boat":

A hard-working party bagman is rewarded. Party politics being what they are, somebody has to raise the funds. It's hard work, being a party bagman, and it's thankless work, in these days when there isn't much patronage to play with.

A bagman's lot is not a happy one unless, as sometimes happens, he hits the jackpot in the form of an appointment to the Senate.

Bagmen generally deal in boxcar figures, and so it is not inappropriate to mention what a Senate appointment means to them as a tangible reward for their services.

The most recent appointee is 41 years of age. Should he live to 75, his total emolument at \$15,000 a year would be \$510,000—a lifetime income dwarfing such measly items as the cash award with the Nobel prize, or a win in the Irish sweepstakes, or a football pool in Britain.

I am not complaining from the point of view of some of my Liberal friends across the way, like the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Habel), who all of us hope before the sacred age of 75 rolls around will be called; but some of us feel that the other place should be reserved for people like Azellus Denis, and Yvon Dupuis, because that is the natural place for them. The last seven or eight appointments have been made along this line.

This new approach from the radicals, the reformers, over on the other side is just too much, Mr. Speaker, and I felt I had to draw the attention of the house even at ten o'clock to how inconsistent and how silly the Liberals' claim to be the reformers and the radicals is.

The real question is, when are they going to get rid of the Senate? I should have liked to have the time to go back and read a beautiful little speech made by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) in 1962. I would refer all my friends who would like to read something of charm about Senate reform to page 1153 of *Hansard* for the session of 1962, wherein he refers to Mackenzie King's stand on Senate reform and stands bravely forth as saying that aside from that one boner in 1925 the Liberal party has always played it nice and safe and cozy on Senate reform. They certainly have played it cozy without going so far as to say they are really going to reform the Senate. In 1962 they did suggest they were going to limit appointments to 15 years. I suggest that even if Mr. Aird or

Mr. Lang or these other characters are wonderful party bagmen, they are a little too young to be given this fantastic emolument until the age of 75 and, of course, at the rate the Liberals move on some of these reforms we are not even sure they will get this reform setting an age limit of 75 through the house. My friend points out that even this reform does not apply to people who were appointed before the bill comes into effect.

Mr. Habel: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, you know it is against the rules.

Mr. Habel: I wish you would.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Hon. J. Watson MacNaught (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely sure that the discussion of Senate reform is in order tonight because, as the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) said, there is an item on the order paper, order No. 40, which provides for a measure of Senate reform.

Mr. Knowles: I have one there too.

Mr. MacNaught: This measure will be brought on for debate as soon as possible after the legislation outlined by the Prime Minister has been dealt with by the house, and I am sure there will be ample opportunity then to discuss all aspects of Senate reform.

I also detected in the remarks of the hon. member for Port Arthur an inference that this party is only interested in appointing what he referred to as party bagmen. I want to point out to him that when I first entered the house back in 1945 a very learned legal light from Stanstead in the province of Quebec, Mr. John Hackett, was sitting on the opposite side of the house. He was appointed to the Senate by the former prime minister, Louis St. Laurent.

I also seem to recall that on another occasion Mr. St. Laurent offered a Senate appointment to Mr. M. J. Coldwell which he, for reasons best known to himself, refused. I do not believe that by any stretch of the imagination these two men could be called bagmen of the Liberal party.

Mr. Fisher: Look at the last eight.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.10 p.m.