

I follow these recollections and reflections with a hearty salute to the present occupant of the Speaker's Chair. I was in the House of Commons when he arrived; I was there when he left; and I was happy to become his colleague in this illustrious chamber. He is a sensitive and compassionate man, with a courageous and consistent devotion to Canada, and I wish him well in his important task.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Senator Macquarrie:** Honourable senators, in making my maiden speech in this chamber last October, I complimented the then opposition for taking seriously their duty in the Question Period, interrogating the excellent ministers then in office. Senator Perrault, with his usual informality, asked:

Would you like to sit over on this side?

And I replied:

Some day I may be there, but not for a while.

Well, honourable senators, it has been a much shorter "while" than I had expected. If a Presbyterian may give reference to such a line *sic transit gloria mundi*.

As Senator Flynn noted the other day, we Conservatives generally find ourselves in the opposition. One might say we are a rightist party, normally residing on the Speaker's left.

I consider myself a lucky man to be only 60 years old and to actually remember living through three Tory governments. Usually, of course, I am in a minority, and quite often in a minority within a minority. From my present location, as I look at the benches across, and the benches to my left and to my right, I am reminded of just a bit of one of Tennyson's poems that I read years ago:

Cannon to right of them  
Cannon to left of them,  
Cannon in front of them  
Volley'd and thunder'd.

I said, honourable senators, that I recalled only a "bit" of that poem. We are not here as a Light Brigade. This happy band is not of that category at all. Rather, we plan to fight again and win the day, toughened and tried once more by the strains and stresses of adversity. If I am seen peering across the way with some difficulty, it is because of the clerestory light, and not that I think the horizon is so far removed for a victory for our party.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Senator Macquarrie:** I am neither dispirited nor discouraged. A Progressive Conservative must have a great deal of faith, and even more hope. It also helps if he has a good memory. I can well recall as a young boy when in 1935 an election resulted in the return of R. B. Bennett and a magnificent host of 38 colleagues. Earlier in the province of Prince Edward Island we had an election, the result of which was 30 to zero for the Liberals. Eventually—and, my God, how eventually—the Progressive Conservative Party did regain office. For much of that interval, reigning supreme was Mackenzie King who, in 1930, bewailed that he and his party were

[Senator Macquarrie.]

in the valley of humiliation—far too shallow and far too short a valley, I thought it was.

It is my pleasant task to congratulate the ministers sitting in the Senate. The government leader is an old friend. As well as being a colleague in this house, he was a colleague in the other place. He is a genial, hardworking man; a conscientious man. As government leader in the Senate he has sometimes made mistakes; but when he does, he does so with flair—and I appreciate flair in anything.

His two colleagues from the Senate in the ministry, I am proud to call friends. Senator Flynn the other day, in talking to them and about them, noted that the bearded one was now unbearded, and vice versa, and he remarked on a change of face. I thought he had actually said a "change of faith", for while it is true that they both went to Damascus, they went by different routes. They have now arrived in a promised land of sorts, if I may mix the Old and New Testaments together. But they are good parliamentarians. When they erred in the past, it was because of misguided judgment, not from ill-intentioned wrong.

I followed very carefully—being a senator, I was not numbed—the post-election performance of the Liberal Party in respect of its response to its complete shutout in the great western provinces. There were alarms and excursions, speculation and anxiety, and a feverish search for a solution. Manitoba's Liberal members were sent on safari—a sort of two musketeers, because there were not three. They sought a solution; they sought advice. There seemed to be reluctance to appoint senators as full-fledged ministers.

That attitude, I thought, was a denigration, both to the Senate and to the west. In the agony about the kind of representation—and really what they were concerned about was party representation—there was here all along this chamber which, by its very nature, is representative, a magnificently representative body made up of people from the professions, former provincial premiers, former ministers, men of substance, and poor people like myself. We have here in this chamber a broadly representative group.

But now we find that many senators have been passed over. There are many fine senators from the western provinces, capable and competent of being cabinet ministers. I had the privilege for many years of sitting across from cabinets, so I know what I speak of when I say there are many senators who could make good cabinet ministers, either by comparison or absolutely.

I was surprised that there was a tendency to demur on this course. I cannot understand why more senators were not appointed. The great province of British Columbia has only one minister. Terrible; terrible! As good as that minister is, the government leader cannot take the place of three or four. The great province of Alberta, one minister! What is wrong with the rest of the senators from Alberta? I expected at least half a dozen ministers to be appointed from this illustrious chamber. If I were a senator from that part of the country, I would be wondering what I lacked. I know what I lack. I lack the party