

appointments for the last two decades in which promised Senate reform failed to materialize.

The Prime Minister has begun to redress the balance. But this is not Senate reform as Canadians have visualized it, nor the type of Senate reform to which the Conservative national convention gave its pledge less than a year ago.

Now that is fairly mild; no one will complain about it.

The next editorial is from the *Globe and Mail*, of Monday, October 14, 1957. I will read it to you, and I suggest that if any honourable senators have very high blood pressure they had better hang on to their seats.

Hon. Mr. Brunt: We know it by heart.

Hon. Mr. Davies: I will read it:

Surveying the six Senate nominations made by Prime Minister Diefenbaker last Saturday, the Canadian public has for the first time good cause to feel disappointed with the new Government at Ottawa.

Throughout his election campaign, Mr. Diefenbaker promised to reform the Senate. Precisely how, he did not say. But, gathering the Conservative leader to be as concerned as they were at the low estate to which the Senate had fallen,

How do you like that?

thoughtful Canadians deduced that he had in mind—or intended to work out—some means of restoring public confidence in it. For example, by naming to it men and women of nationally recognized ability. Mr. Diefenbaker had the opportunity so to do. When he took office there were sixteen vacancies in the Senate. He could have given a token of his intention by allocating some of these Senate seats to people who had a real contribution to make.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. Davies: Don't worry; I am going to deal with it. By the way, I thought the lighting of this chamber had been attended to, but it is not very good.

But the kind of appointments he subsequently made (eight in all) do not differ in any great measure from the kind made by his predecessor. No doubt the half dozen senators named by the Prime Minister on Saturday are, like the two named by him previously, respectable and intelligent men.

That is complimentary.

No doubt, there were good political reasons for choosing them. But we do not see that they will make for a more vigorous or more effective Upper House.

I wish the *Globe and Mail* would get blacker printer's ink.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: The *Globe* is always hard to read.

Hon. Mr. Davies (reading):

It may be that the Prime Minister still intends to reform, really to reform, the Senate.

There is more, a lot more, but it is a strain to read it and I will not continue. I am sure honourable senators will agree with me that the article is a real slap in the face, but on me it has little effect. Not for one moment would I object to the right of the *Globe and Mail* to say anything it pleases

about the Senate. I have been an active newspaper editor since 1908 and I am a firm believer in the freedom of the press. Furthermore, I have a high regard for the *Globe and Mail*. It is a high-class paper, well edited, and with an excellent news service. I read it every day; I would be lost without it. I am afraid, however, that the *Globe and Mail*, in common with many other newspapers, does not understand the Senate, nor has it taken the trouble to examine carefully the work which the Senate has done and is still doing. When a newspaper urges reform of the Senate I think it would be much fairer if it would say in just what way it wants the Senate reformed.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Davies: Just exactly what should the Senate do that it is not doing today?

Let us not forget that promises to reform the Senate are by no means new. In 1896 Sir Wilfrid Laurier went up and down the country saying that he was going to reform the Senate if he was given the power. Well, the power was given him. Other political leaders have promised, when out of office, to do the same. But when they attained office they found that reform of the Senate was more easy to talk about than to put into practice. According to some people, the Senate is composed of a lot of overpaid, doddering old men who know very little about legislating in the country's interest. That is far from being the case, as I hope in a few minutes to show successfully. But before I do so, let me say that I disagree entirely with both the *Victoria Daily Times* and the *Toronto Globe and Mail* that it is wrong to appoint political workers. I would like to point out to the *Globe and Mail* that the members of the Senate are of quite as good calibre today as when the late Mr. Jaffray, the then owner of the *Globe*, was a member of this honourable body, and in no way inferior in ability, wisdom and honesty of purpose to those who were senators when the father of the present owner of that newspaper was a distinguished member of this house.

I have no use whatever for those supercilious people who talk in a haughty manner about refusing to have anything to do with politics because it is a "dirty business". Politics is not a dirty business. It is really what I regard as the science of government. The people who take no interest in politics are not, in my opinion, good citizens. I will not go so far as to say that I believe in compulsory voting, but I do feel that the men and women who do not interest themselves in the election of representatives to our legislatures and to our federal Parliament are not first-class citizens.