

sure there are many colleagues here from New Brunswick who remember her effective role in that position.

Since being summoned to this place in 1978 Senator Anderson has advocated an expansion of the role of women in Canadian life, a cause for which, although much has been done in Senator Anderson's time in this place, she still feels much more needs to be done. Senator Anderson has addressed many important issues: forest policy in her home province, an area of deep experience and expertise; health care; and the always controversial issue of abortion. I am sure all members who were present at that time will remember the eloquent tribute Senator Anderson paid to the peace initiative of former Prime Minister Trudeau in 1984.

Honourable senators, I speak for myself—and I believe for others—when I say that we will miss most the quality of her presence. I wish to turn around something Mr. Churchill said about Mr. Attlee: When told that Mr. Attlee was a humble person, Mr. Churchill replied, “He has a great deal to be humble about!” The exact opposite applies to Margaret Anderson. She is a person of humility—quiet and modest, but with many qualities she has no reason whatever to be modest about. She has good business judgment, cool common sense, good political judgment, and is intellectually and morally a person of accomplishment and character—a person whom everyone is proud to applaud as being a Canadian.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I am glad to have an opportunity today to continue my long-running speech about Senate reform, because a fundamental reform in the Canadian Senate will take place on August 22, 1990—though not necessarily because of my speech. On that day Senator Flynn will no longer be among its members. That fact will certainly change the Canadian Senate. Some will think it represents a loss; others might feel otherwise. Anyone who has observed him and me in the Senate itself, and often in committees, might consider me among the latter group.

Not long after my appointment to the Senate I found myself on the opposition benches; the back ones, in fact, in the corner where Senator Marsden is now sitting. When the Clark administration was in power and Senator Flynn was the Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister of Justice, I was a rash, new boy. I cannot remember the exact details, but he was sitting where Senator Murray is sitting and I was sitting back in the corner. An issue had come up involving competition policy, an area in which I fancied I had some experience, having prosecuted a few cases. I stood up and started a series of questions, which led, I admit, to my deciding, brashly and rashly, to take him on—though I do not know where I got the nerve to take on this titan of forensic and parliamentary majesty, but I did.

We went toe-to-toe at it so strongly that afterwards several of my colleagues said to me, as a new boy, “The Senate is not a courtroom.” I said, “I know, but Senator Flynn is a lawyer.” They said, “Well, perhaps you two can have it out somewhere else, but not here.” That started what I think many of our

[Senator Frith.]

colleagues thought was an all-too-characteristic antagonism. From then on Senator Flynn and I always seemed to disagree about everything politically—sometimes so violently that we both behaved a bit disgracefully, although, of course, he always won the “disgraceful behaviour” contest. I must admit, though, occasionally it was only by a photofinish.

Senator Flynn, Renée, and I were at dinner within the last couple of months. I came in and went over to Jacques and said, “Jacques, I have a terrible problem. I do not think Senator MacEachen will be present for the tributes and I will have to present the tributes for our side. But I cannot think of a nice thing to say about you,” to which Renée said, “Don't you two ever quit?” Then Jacques said:

[*Translation*]

“He is always the one to start. He is at it once again.”

[*English*]

As it turned out—and as you can imagine—I simply had not worked hard enough to find something to say, because I found lots of good things when I tried harder.

Senator Flynn's public career started naturally as the grandson of a former Quebec premier. Concurrent with his political career, he had been a distinguished member of the legal profession, appearing many times before the Supreme Court of Canada. He was elected to the House of Commons in 1958, as has been pointed out, and was regarded immediately as an “up and comer,” which is exactly what he turned out to be.

Senator Murray has told us about Jacques Flynn's distinguished career in Parliament, in cabinet, in the Senate, and in the Conservative Party. Quite naturally, he became the government leader in the Senate with the election of the Clark government in 1979, and he undertook the arduous duties of Minister of Justice at the same time—duties that, as I have said, I tried to make as arduous as I could, although not always with much success. In a newspaper interview Senator Flynn remarked that he would not be passive in his new role. I can testify to the fact that he was not.

He then returned to the leadership of the opposition when I was Deputy Leader of the Government. He performed that task with his customary effectiveness—often too effectively for my taste—on a wide variety of issues. As befitting an attorney of his stature, Senator Flynn has made a significant contribution in the areas of constitution and Senate reform, as well as various changes to criminal law.

On a more personal level, I was able to come up with other characteristics of his that I admire. He is certainly abrasive.

Senator Simard: No!

Senator Perrault: No!

Senator Frith: Do I detect the impression that I am using too mild a term?

I never opposed Senator Flynn in a courtroom, but I can imagine that it would be a bruising experience. He is a most effective street fighter—nay, alley fighter some might say, and very good at it. Of course, that is coupled with a great knowledge of the law, great forensic skill, and great oratorical