

first come into contact with what is sometimes referred to as Canada's national magazine, *Maclean's*. In that copy, the first I had ever seen, the leading article was entitled, "How I Made a Hole in One," and it was over the name of Grattan O'Leary. I had never heard of him before. I read the article with considerable enjoyment. It was a beautiful piece of humour. At that time I had no idea what a "hole in one" was. In Newfoundland 40 or 50 years ago we had not too many golf courses. However, that article was certainly intrinsically interesting and it gave me a keen desire to meet its author.

● (1530)

It was a great pleasure to me when I came to this Senate to find that Senator O'Leary was still here with us. I can only repeat what I said here in recent months, that is, that if I were given the choice of selecting a debating opponent, the last one I would choose would be Senator O'Leary. Of course, I do not go along with all of his views, but I will say that whenever he speaks it is vastly entertaining and, more than that, it is vastly educational.

I want to make a brief passing reference—and some time I hope to deal with it more fully—to this nonsense that we hear from time to time about age. There are people who are over-aged, who are elderly, at 50, and there are others in their 80's, as we saw here today in the person of Senator O'Leary, whose minds and tongues are just as active, just as alert, just as penetrating, as they were 40 years ago. That is manifested par excellence in the person of Senator O'Leary.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rowe: Finally, on these introductory matters, I would like, as a large "L" Liberal, and, I hope, a small "l" Liberal, to re-affirm my continuing confidence in the present administration of Her Majesty's Government in Canada and in the leadership of the Prime Minister. I do not, as honourable senators may recall, make a practice, and I have no intention of beginning to make a practice, of talking partisan politics, in the narrow sense of the word, in this chamber; but I feel that every senator has the right, on occasions such as this, in these historic debates on the Speech from the Throne, to say where he stands on the overriding issues confronting our nation.

The Speech from the Throne deals with some of the major problems of our time in a cool and unexcited and dispassionate manner. This is as it should be. The complex problems of world energy supplies, of inflation and its concomitant, the cost of living, unemployment, regional disparity—these are all matters with regard to which there is always a danger of someone appealing to the emotions of our people, with consequent pressing of panic buttons and of resorting to extreme measures which, in the end, can be self-defeating.

The Speech indicates that, while aware of the seriousness and magnitude of these great problems, and while equally aware that when confronted by them some action must be taken, the government appreciates also the danger of rushing off madly in all directions, frantically and fruitlessly searching for solutions. That has happened elsewhere with disastrous effect. We have to be, to some extent, fatalists about some of these problems, in the sense that we must face up to the fact that most of them are international in scope and are therefore outside our

[Hon. Mr. Rowe.]

immediate and direct control. I am not using this argument as an excuse for inaction.

We must remind ourselves also of the fact that for some of these problems there never can be a final and complete solution, and that we would be fooling ourselves, we would be guilty of childish conduct, if we convinced ourselves that there are final and absolute solutions to such problems as inflation.

Inflation has always been present, ever since man came out of the cave or down out of the trees, or wherever he came from. It was present in Rome at the time of Augustus, two thousand years ago, no less than it is at the time of our own Queen Elizabeth. It was equally as persistent during the Napoleonic wars as it is today. We cannot ignore it, but we should not lose our sense or proportion. History has shown that when potential dangers are recognized, and realistically appraised, and when appropriate restraining actions are taken from time to time, it is a disease that, while we cannot cure it, at least we can keep in check. In short, it is a disease that need not be fatal. This, I think, is the lesson of history in so far as inflation is concerned. In my opinion, our preoccupation—one might almost say our obsession—with these major and immediate and urgent problems of inflation, of energy crises, and the like, confronts us with the possibility of an even more serious danger, which is that we might ignore or fail to cope adequately with other basic problems which, in the long run, could lead to a deterioration in our way of life or, if not to a deterioration, at least to a state of stagnation, which in the long view could be equally disastrous.

Among the basic assumptions of democracy, as we know it, must be numbered respect for the needs and aspirations and rights of the individual. During the past year we have seen, by way of the revelations in the United States, how easy it is for powerful and unscrupulous agencies to erode this principle. While we have watched with sympathy and admiration the agonizing efforts that that great nation has made, and is making at this moment, to re-assert the basic rights of citizens and to affirm that principle of the rights of the individual, we cannot but have a feeling akin to horror—as I am sure thousands of Canadians had—that such insidious and, for a period at least, such undetected inroads could have been made into the very vitals of the democratic process and the democratic way of life, and all, incidentally, done under the guise and in the name of democracy.

We in Canada, while we sympathize, should do more than that. We should watch the situation, and guide ourselves accordingly.

Another great assumption of our way of life is that by goodwill and perseverance and determination, our way of life can be improved. Here I fear I am going to have to take issue with one or two of the points made by my distinguished friend who just spoke. I say that another of the great assumptions by which we govern ourselves is that our way of life can be improved. That improvement cannot take place, however, if we allow ourselves to be distracted by the emergencies and the crises of the moment.

Perhaps I can best express the idea that I have in mind by referring to an incident which took place in the mother