

As was said by the Honourable Judy LaMarsh, there is nothing in it whatsoever about smoking or cancer or anything like that. When the smoke is cleared away and we are left the mere skeleton, there is nothing much.

Honourable senators, when I hear about the Minister of Defence of the present Government sending a corps, or an army platoon, or whatever they call it, to search Ashbury College for rifles, I wonder what we are coming to. It sounds like *Alice in Wonderland*.

I was in the House of Commons yesterday when the Minister of National Defence, the Honourable Mr. Hellyer, in reply to a question, explained that the military platoon or corps arrived at Ashbury College at the late hour of 12.30 a.m. because of a breakdown of the vehicle involved. But what in heaven's name is the Department of Defence doing sending out a military party like that to inspect places like Ashbury College and Woodstock Collegiate in Oxford? I understand that they went to the collegiate in Oxford County, took some of the ammunition and left the rifles. Apparently they did not know what they were doing at all.

I say that the Department of National Defence in Canada should be doing more than spying on colleges and collegiates or any such institutions. If they want to do something, they should go to the armouries and protect them, but for heaven's sake, let them keep away from the collegiates and colleges of this country.

This may never have happened before but I understand that at times some officials take more power than they should. But here we have the spectacle of their going to Ashbury College at 12.30 in the morning and commandeering all the ammunition, rifles and pistols, or whatever there was, and doing the same to Woodstock Collegiate.

It reminded me of a cartoon that appeared in the paper the other day of two Oxford students duelling over a woman. That is how the Department of National Defence appears to me when they do what they have been doing.

Honourable senators, in regard to the subject of redistribution, those proposals were introduced by the former Government and a committee was set up to look after that matter. I understand, according to the Speech from the Throne, that that is also the intention of the present Government. Whatever it is, redistribution must be done on a non-partisan scale and it must be a fair proposal for everybody. I have hopes that that will be done.

On the question of election expenses, there are other senators who will speak with more authority than I can, although I have had

something to do with that in the past. Senator Grosart and others will probably speak on this point, and I do not propose to enlarge upon it.

Honourable senators, to me the Speech from the Throne was really only platitudes; it did not have any meat in it; it deals only with something we are proposing to do and leaves everything hanging in the air. I think the Speech from the Throne should be more than that—it should tell us what legislation we are to have.

Honourable senators, as to Senate reform, it is said that proposals will be introduced for Senate reform which will be satisfactory to everyone. No one knows what the proposals are or what the terms are. I think they should be explicit.

There have been changes in the cabinet. As I have said, from this side of the house we certainly welcome Senator Connolly to the cabinet. He is a sound and sensible lawyer and businessman, and I think he will add lustre to the cabinet just as his predecessor Senator Ross Macdonald did.

I wish to add—and I am quoting now from the Leader of the Opposition in the other house—that during the recess the Minister of Labour announced a plan whereby each Canadian would carry an identification card. I think the proposal exempts clergymen and farmers; that includes me, so I am absolved from the proposal that each person carry such a card.

As the Leader of the Opposition in the other house said, in the future our newspaper social columns will report that Miss 925340 was married to Mr. 83457, and that the only name appearing in the column would be that of the officiating clergyman. I wonder whether the marriage would be recorded as 00000. I do not think that is a system we want in Canada, to be regimented by numbers. That is not a proper course to pursue. There may be other ways to get around it. Once you have regimentation by numbers you are not far from dictatorship and that is something we do not want here.

I am wholeheartedly in support of what my leader, Senator Brooks, said yesterday, that we should get back to the two-party system in Canada. After all, that is the only safe way to protect democracy. We want the two-party system.

Honourable senators, my speech has been short. I blame it on the Speech from the Throne, that my remarks are non-productive.

I wish to repeat how pleased I am to welcome Senator Connolly to the Government leadership here and to support my leader, the Honourable Senator Brooks, in what he said yesterday.