

were appointed in 1957 when Her Majesty the Queen was opening Parliament. Did we hear any voice of objection from those sitting on the other side? Not one. Not only that, but the Prime Minister of the day, the Right Honourable John G. Diefenbaker, who was sworn in on June 21, 1957, went to the Prime Ministers' Conference in London, England. I realize, of course, that Mr. St. Laurent had his bags packed and his reservations made, but he was enough of a man and a constitutional lawyer to know that he could not attend. Did honourable senators or the members of the party opposite raise any objection to Mr. Diefenbaker's going to the Prime Ministers' Conference in 1957? Not a word of objection was heard, and they thought he did a wonderful job.

So, why the hue and cry in 1962 over Mr. Diefenbaker going to the Prime Ministers' Conference on the European Common Market? I will tell you why. The cup of victory was so close for them on the night of June 18, but suddenly the western farmers came through and success was torn away. The result was frustration, and that was the reason for the hue and cry against the present Prime Minister's going to that conference.

I had the honour to be appointed to this body by John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of this country. I was proud to be appointed by him as—to change the words applied by my friend, the honourable senator from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot)—a “work-horse”, and I will continue to work for him, because I think it is in the interests of Canada to work for such a splendid Prime Minister.

It appears to me that there is some uneasiness on the other side of the chamber. My friend the honourable senator from De la Durantaye raised a point on seven words from the Speech from the Throne. I have combed that speech, and I think I have found the seven words which gave rise to this uneasiness:

Legislation respecting the Senate will be introduced.

What is wrong with those seven words? Why should not legislation respecting the Senate be introduced? The first time I heard about reformation of the Senate was as a boy going to high school in 1919, when my father mentioned it. The Liberal party met in this city and chose the Right Honourable Mackenzie King as their leader, and at that time they had as a plank in their platform the reformation of the Senate. What happened to that plank? I will tell you what happened to it: it died of dry rot.

I think this chamber should consider Government legislation by the Prime Minister

of the day as such legislation is brought before it. I say that we have a moral duty and obligation to examine such legislation and to do so carefully.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** We will do that.

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** So will we.

I wish to say that the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald, Brantford), who is a good friend of mine, in the closing remarks of his speech seemed to be pre-judging the legislation which was forecast in the Speech from the Throne; and it also seemed to me—if I am wrong he can correct me—that he was opposing a lot of things to come before this house.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford):** You cannot read that interpretation into anything I said.

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** I accept the correction and I withdraw any remarks which implied otherwise, but to me it appeared that he had a reservation in respect to the form of legislation which might come before this house. If that is wrong I heartily withdraw because I know my friend is a man of his word and a man of honour.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford):** I said, and it is all that you can read into my remarks, that we will consider all legislation as we have done in the past.

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** Well, it just adds a little more spice to the cake.

Honourable senators have quoted various authorities on the functions of the Senate, and the honourable senator from Carleton (Hon. Mr. O'Leary) quoted Arthur Meighen. I too want to quote Arthur Meighen on the function of this chamber when he said:

Members of the Second Chamber must get away, lift their minds far from those hard-drawn lines of party, or they cannot serve their country. They have to make up their minds to give every government fair play and not to stand in the way of legislation unless they are convinced it must be defeated on its merits . . .

I say to this honourable house that I, as a newcomer to this body, will reserve my judgment and my vote on all legislation that comes before it, and I am not going to have any preconceived ideas about legislation before it comes here, whether from the Government or from the other place. I think it is our obligation and our duty to examine legislation carefully, to give it due consideration, and then to make our decision.

I would like to say in closing that never in my life, and I have been interested in politics for a long time, have I seen a more