

The honourable senator from Gormley (Hon. Mr. McCutcheon) has merited and received my admiration since I first knew him when he was President of the Canadian Welfare Council, and particularly since I heard his presidential address in 1957, which seemed to me a very sensible and intelligent statement of the way a layman looks at welfare. I wish that more laymen in the welfare field in Canada had similar views.

I listened, perhaps with more than usual interest, to the maiden speech of the honourable senator from Carleton (Hon. Mr. O'Leary), who has had such a long and distinguished journalistic career. As he dipped into the past and recalled for us other times and other faces, I am sure that his references brought back nostalgic memories to every honourable senator who was privileged to hear him. However, I feel that I must disagree with him on a number of issues which he discussed, and I regret that he is not present today.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford): He will read your speech.

Hon. Mrs. Fergusson: Times have indeed changed with the passage of years, and it is true that Canada's press can no longer be designated by political affiliation to the degree possible in the past. It would also appear that we are likely to find there is not the same spirit of adherence at all times to the two-party system in Canada. Frankly, I do not think these are necessarily retrograde developments. We have had diversions from the two-party system before, and some of those whom I consider amongst our finest members of Parliament of the past have been members of some other parties. I am sure that if the two-party system is in the best interests of the Canadian people, it will ultimately prevail. I certainly feel that present-day Canadians are just as interested in Canada's welfare and its future as were the people of Canada at any time in the past, and that in the fullness of time this will become abundantly clear.

I am sure we all learned with regret that the honourable senator seems to entertain some misgivings concerning the atmosphere of this place, and that he feels it may be a little difficult for him to adjust to this chamber. In fact, to me the tenor of his remarks rather suggested the cynicism which he seems to feel exists in Canada regarding parties and public men. I am sure I speak for all honourable senators when I assure him that in order to adjust here he will find, with the passage of time, that it will not be necessary for him to divest himself of his philosophy of life or those principles that have been his guideposts through the years.

However, I am sure that with his long association with the Canadian political scene, the honourable senator will agree with me that in the grand scheme of Confederation, the founding fathers very clearly had in mind the establishment of a second place where, on occasion, the problems confronting the nation could be considered, removed to some extent at least, from the heated political atmosphere which on occasions prevails in the other place. I think there have been occasions in rather recent memory when many Canadians, if not the majority, have offered prayerful thanks for the foresight of our founding fathers.

Obviously the honourable senator's ideas on the subject of political partisanship in the Senate conflict basically with those of the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen who, the senator from Carleton (Hon. Mr. O'Leary) stated, was his hero of public life.

In a speech by the Right Honourable Senator Meighen made before the Canadian Club of Montreal, and reprinted as an appendix to the Senate *Hansard* of August 6, 1960, he said:

The Senate is worthless if it becomes merely another Commons divided upon party lines and indulging in party debates such as are familiar in the Lower Chamber session after session. If the Senate ever permits itself to fulfil that function and that alone in the scheme of Confederation, then the sooner it is abolished the better.

Honourable senators, when I first entered this chamber I was happy to see that partisanship did not invade it, and on many occasions when I was called to speak outside of the Senate on the subject of my experiences here I stressed this point, and I quoted in support of my argument statements from speeches by Senator Meighen, Senator Dandurand, Senator Roebuck, and by the recently deceased Senator John T. Haig, who was summoned to the Senate in 1935 and was Leader of the Conservative party in this house from 1945 to 1957.

The late Senator Haig was highly regarded by members of both sides of this house, as those who were not here during his time will learn by reading in *Hansard* the many speeches regarding him when, after a serious accident in 1953, he was incapacitated for a time and unable to be with us. When he returned he received many congratulatory speeches, not all from the members of his own party. It is true that he always remained loyal to the philosophy and principles of his party, but as far as I can remember he was careful not to intrude provocative references to them into this chamber.