

## THE SENATE

Thursday, October 11, 1962

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

### ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. A. J. Brooks:** Honourable senators, I move, with leave of the Senate, that when the Senate adjourns today it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, October 16, 1962, at 8 o'clock in the evening.

Motion agreed to.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY—DEBATE  
CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Hon. Mr. Haig, seconded by Hon. Mr. Fournier (Madawaska-Restigouche), for an address in reply thereto.

**Hon. Donald Cameron:** Honourable senators, first of all may I join with those who have preceded me to pay my respects and compliments to you, Mr. Speaker, and to say how happy we are that you have been elevated to this very important position. We recognize this as a fitting recognition of your long years of service in the other place and in this chamber.

May I at the same time express to the new Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Brooks) my felicitations on his elevation to that position. We hope that he will enjoy his service in the new capacity.

I would also like to say a word to our friend, the senator from Rosetown (Hon. Mr. Aseltine), who with kindness and understanding over the years was particularly helpful to those of us who are relatively new in this chamber. I wish him many more years in the seat he occupies.

To those who are "new boys" in this house, may I also say that we welcome them, and I hope they will enjoy their experience here. We look forward to working with them.

Finally, may I offer my compliments to the mover (Hon. Mr. Haig) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Fournier, Madawaska-Restigouche) of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would say they have made an excellent beginning.

Honourable senators, in speaking in this debate today, I want first to comment on some of the things that were in the Speech from

the Throne and some that were not. By way of introduction, may I say that I read in the *Victoria Daily Times* of August 28 last a very thoughtful article, by that well-known Canadian writer, Bruce Hutchison, who was reviewing some passages from J. W. Dafoe's *Life of Laurier*, in which Dafoe referred to the delayed reaction to certain events as "subterranean currents in the life of a democracy." Dafoe had referred to the execution of Louis Riel as one of these, and to the conscription election of 1917 as "unnoted watersheds from which the currents flowed in the most surprising directions." I would commend this article to anyone who would take the time to read it because it has some rather pertinent observations on the current situation.

Hutchison went on to say that in the life of our democracy today,

We are on just such a watershed and the currents escape our eyes—the subterranean currents of a democracy dissatisfied with all parties—as tiny trickles in the mountains become, a few miles further on, the Fraser and the Saskatchewan moving to separate oceans.

If we cannot estimate the currents, the watershed itself is clear enough—the great issue facing us which the politicians try to blur.

And this, to their own advantage. This applies to all kinds of parties.

The article continues:

Is the nation prepared to pay the price, accept the responsibilities and solve the problems of nationhood? Or will it follow the easy downhill grade that our fathers refused to follow in times much harder than these? Our party politics, in all their disorder, are important only as they reflect or, better still, as they lead us in the largest decisions of our history.

Using the Dafoe theme of delayed reaction to important historical events, such as the execution of Riel and the conscription election of 1917, Hutchison was drawing the conclusion that the two-party system in Canada might be undergoing some degree of disintegration, certainly some measure of fundamental change.

The fact that 1,900,000 electors cast their votes for the representatives of the New Democratic Party and the Social Credit Party lends some credence to the point Hutchison was making. It is true that the storm warnings are up for the traditional parties, and if they are to survive and retain their traditional hold on the allegiance of the Canadian electorate they must convince the average voter that they are prepared to seek some