

Scotia in this bill; that the provincial authority saw fit to enter into the agreement with the federal government, and that, between them, they hold all the powers of sovereignty in this matter—I am satisfied that we in this appointed chamber ought not to interfere in any way.

I am pleased that I was given this opportunity to speak on a bill which affects Nova Scotia at this time. I was appointed to represent, as I have often been told, regional interests. Well, I come from Nova Scotia and am proud to say so, and I like to think that during my years in this chamber I have endeavoured to express the point of view of Nova Scotia on the many issues that have come before us. I have no regrets about that. I seized every opportunity I could to voice the concerns of my province and I have no feeling as I leave the Senate today that my sojourn in the Senate has been wasted. I have a strong feeling that the Senate is a much maligned body and that we accomplish much in this chamber that goes unnoticed or is badly understood. I had an opportunity only yesterday of speaking to a young Nova Scotian civics student. He asked me a number of questions relating to civic and government matters. I would judge from listening to that young man that a great many of the ideas that have been instilled in him by his teachers and professors would not appeal to the members of this house. I think that the Senate needs better advertising.

If I may express disagreement with my leaders, I believe that no useful effect will be achieved by electing members to the Senate. I have heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition express an opposite view to mine on a few occasions and I do not expect to convince him, but I can see no benefit or use in electing members to this chamber. I cannot, any more than my colleague the party whip could, as he said the other afternoon, see what benefits could accrue to this house.

The totality of national powers is between the provinces and the federal government, and in the same sense the totality of the national powers is between the House of Commons and the Senate, and if we lack authority now, and if, as the committee on the subject suggests, no additional authority is to be given to us, then I can see no advantage in having an elected Senate. Elected senators will not be any more useful. In fact they will be less useful because they will be frustrated. They will be men and women who will have submitted themselves to the electorate, who will have felt the approval of the electorate only to come to a chamber that leaves them powerless to affect substantially the course of events. Therefore, I cannot see that they will be one bit better off by having been elected than we are by having been appointed. If they are elected, all of the defects of the election, which the honourable senator pointed out yesterday, will accrue. I believe that they will be under obligation to party and to political friends, and that they will sit in this chamber owing debts to people. We may be appointed, but we are free.

● (1110)

On the question of appointment I want to say to my honourable friends that, under the present disposition, we are appointed to this Senate by the Prime Minister of Canada under the identical conditions in force for the selection and

appointment of justices of the Supreme Court of Canada. I am just as good as any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada. The Prime Minister of Canada said that he wanted me in the Senate, and no judge can say more. He can only say that insofar as this court is concerned the Prime Minister of Canada wanted me to serve in this court. But honourable senators on the other side are responsible for a whole new disposition on constitutional questions in this country. Willy-nilly, rightfully or wrongfully, understanding or not understanding what they were doing, they have succeeded in transferring the ultimate source of power away from the seats of the elected members and into the hands of the appointed ones. When you hear people say that the Senate is not an effective body because it is an appointed body, then you can reply that every argument you can make with respect to the method of appointment of senators applies with equal force at the present time to the justices of the Supreme Court of Canada. They are vested with tremendous authority. Yet, the committee has recommended that we not be given any additional authority.

I have talked long, and yet I have mentioned only a few of the things that have occurred to me as a result of my service in this chamber. I should like to repeat again that I am delighted to have been here; I am delighted with the treatment I have received and I am grateful to have met all of you and to know you, and if I never return I will have fond and good memories of you. But if I do return, I promise not to harangue you in the way I have this morning.

In closing, I urge you to support the bill. It is a good bill, in the sense that it represents an agreement between the only two forces that have the right to enter into that agreement. Therefore, I support its passage. It did not require the excellent treatment that it received in its presentation because you should have been satisfied to say, "If Nova Scotia is satisfied and the Government of Canada is satisfied and if they have entered into an agreement, then who am I to stand between them?" I urge you to support this bill and as I resume my seat on this occasion I want to say that it is my heartfelt wish that all of you live through and enjoy the national holiday—Dominion Day—that we are about to celebrate on July 1.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as I join in this debate on the first branch of Senator Donahoe's intervention—and perhaps I can be extended the same courtesy as far as relevancy is concerned—I should like to say that while Senator Donahoe and I disagree on just about everything that he has said, that comes as no news to him or to anyone else in this chamber.

I am a strong supporter of the party system. I consider it one of the most important parts of our democratic system, although it is not mentioned at all in the Constitution and is only mentioned in a few statutes dealing with election expenses and that sort of thing. The French word for "supporter" is "militant," and I think that the French word would apply to Senator Donahoe when it comes to support for his party because his support is never less than militant. I cannot agree