

a bit too long, but 15 years would, in my opinion, have been a safer compromise. However, no doubt we shall have an opportunity of discussing the bill when it comes before us.

I do not think it is the duty of the Opposition majority in the Senate to try to kill Government legislation; but I do think it is our duty to analyze it thoroughly. Honourable senators have always analyzed all bills which have come before this house in a careful and painstaking manner. I believe that bills which the new Government will send to us should have the same careful analysis that we gave to bills brought in by the previous Government.

I might say I am glad that when Mr. St. Laurent learned of the election returns he resigned. Honourable senators will recall that in 1925 the Conservatives were returned with 116 seats and the Liberals with 101. There was also the Progressive party which had, I think, about 25 seats. In any event, the Liberals at that time decided to wait and meet Parliament. That was a decision with which I personally did not agree. I sat in the Press Gallery of the House of Commons during the first week of the session in January 1926, and I remember very well the debate on motions of confidence and non-confidence in the Government. On Monday the Honourable Ernest Lapointe moved a vote of confidence in the Government, and the Honourable R. B. Bennett moved a vote of non-confidence. When the votes were counted, about two o'clock on Thursday morning, the Government was sustained by a majority of two. But it did not last long.

It is peculiar how history repeats itself. On June 23, 1896, the Government which had been headed in succession by Sir John Macdonald, Sir John Abbott, Sir John Thompson, Sir M. Bowell and Sir Charles Tupper was defeated by the Liberals under Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It was a big surprise, but the vote was decisive. Ontario gave the Liberals 44 seats against 41 for the Conservative party. Quebec, where Laurier had been freely denounced, gave him 49 seats, the Conservatives 16. Manitoba, where the Manitoba school question was the big issue, gave Laurier 4 seats and the Conservatives 2.

Sir Clifford Sifton, who had been a minister in the Manitoba Government, joined the Laurier Government in November 1896. Shortly after the 1896 election gold was discovered in the Yukon. The prospectors and settlers were very much irritated because the most direct route lay through American territory for part of the way and they were charged custom duties on their effects. Not long after his appointment as Minister of the Interior, Sir Clifford Sifton made a trip to the Yukon and thoroughly investigated the

situation. He decided that a railway should be built from the Stikine river to Teslin lake. A contract was made with Mackenzie and Mann for building the railway, and he placed the matter before Parliament in a four-hour speech. The bill was carried in the House of Commons. However, at that time the situation in the Senate was reversed. The Conservatives were in the majority and they promptly killed the Yukon Railway Bill.

That was 60 years ago, honourable senators. Today the Senate is far less bitterly partisan than it was then. I agree wholeheartedly with the attitude expressed by my leader (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) in this house last week as to the duty of the Opposition. We must watch legislation carefully, but the Liberal majority should not use its power to defeat measures brought in by the new Government.

Now, honourable senators, my main purpose in rising today is to discuss the second paragraph of the Speech from the Throne. It reads as follows:

Parliamentary Government has been fashioned by the wisdom of many centuries. Its justice, authority and dignity are cherished by men of goodwill. It will be the high purpose of my ministers not only to preserve these qualities but to take steps to make both houses of this Parliament more effective in the discharge of their responsibilities to the people of Canada.

So far as I can see, there is nothing in that paragraph with which this honourable house can find any fault. I interpret it as meaning that more use is going to be made of the Senate and that more Government legislation will be initiated in this house than has been the practice in the past. If that is the intention I am sure no honourable senator will object. The Senate has always been and still is willing to deal with any amount of legislation that is put before it, and, I may add, to deal with it carefully and well.

I have explained my interpretation of the paragraph. Unfortunately however, that does not appear to be the interpretation put upon it by some newspapers. During the election campaign the present Prime Minister referred in many speeches to the reform of the Senate. He did not explain just what he meant by reform of the Senate, but some newspapers, and some organizations which have been passing resolutions, seem to have read into the reference to the reform of the Senate a change in the personnel appointed to the Senate, the appointment of a different type of men and women. I will read two editorials which I have with me.

The first is from the *Victoria Times*:

Mr. Diefenbaker's first action on the Senate is the appointment of six Conservatives to fill Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan vacancies in the upper chamber. This is quite proper. It helps, in a small way, to reduce the overwhelming Liberal predominance—the result of continuous Liberal