

dividends, it has other beneficial effects as far as personal taxation is concerned. He gave the instance of a married man with two children and having an income of \$3,000. In 1948 his tax was \$230; in 1952, only \$130, part of which goes to provide for an old age pension of \$960 to himself and his wife.

It seems to me, honourable senators, that the honourable senator's speech contained the essence of sound governmental finance and sound government policy in regard to trade. He said that such a policy is what encourages capital to come in from outside, and that it has paid good dividends to the ordinary taxpayer of today, and I ask, honourable senators, is there any more fitting theatre than the Senate for a doctrine of this kind? I suggest that it is suitable to the Senate, the House of Commons or to any theatre within or without the walls of parliament.

I know that the views of the leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) are different. He has expressed the thought on several occasions that no political speeches should be made in this chamber. It is his right to express his views on this question, but I would remind honourable members that it was not ever thus. When I first came into this chamber the members sitting opposite were very much more numerous than they are today, and I remember well the slashing attacks made on the government of the day by the late Senator Ballantyne, my honourable friend's predecessor. It was certainly a matter of politics on his part, but I think he was quite right in making such speeches. It seems like only yesterday that I listened to the rapier-like speeches of the honourable gentleman from Saltcoats (Hon. Mr. Calder), whose remarks in this chamber were as penetrating as anything I ever listened to. I confess that as a government supporter I often squirmed in my seat when he spoke, but my natural antagonism was greatly softened by my intense admiration of his skill. I remember well the masterful attacks made by the honourable senator from Peterborough (Hon. Mrs. Fallis), even though they were tempered with such an excellent flow of English and manner of presentation that I was always at the point of forgiving her. The honourable leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) has himself been in rare form on occasion, and many a time I have observed many of my supporters just waiting for an opportunity to reply to him. The honourable senator from Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner) is a faithful follower of his leader, but I would rather suspect that before this debate is over he will have something to say about a certain part of his leader's address—and as government leader

in the Senate I have the comfortable feeling that my able colleagues will be ready and willing to reply to any attack he may make on the government.

I would remind the house that the leader of the opposition in the Senate is one of the shrewdest and ablest political figures in Canada. I would be prepared to say that from the point of view of experience, shrewdness and brains he is the leading figure in his party today.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: My honourable friend knows quite well—and here he proves his shrewdness—that if any matter came down to a bitter political debate backwards and forwards, in a house that is so terribly lopsided from the point of view of party affiliations as this one it could hardly receive reasonable and fair consideration. So my honourable friend, with that political astuteness which characterizes him—and the more I see of him the more I think of his astuteness—feels that it would probably be well not to emphasize the political side of any issue, hoping that the latent ability of the colleagues around and behind me here will show itself by their fighting with one another. I suggest to my honourable friends that they do not take too seriously the admonition of the leader of the opposition, but use their own judgment as to whether they will speak politically or not. I certainly would find no fault with anybody on either side of the house for doing that.

I was much interested in my honourable friend's address. Indeed, the more I read it the more I saw in it; and that, among other reasons, was why it seemed to me that I should take an extra day in the careful preparation of my own remarks. His speech was very moderate in tone, as honourable senators know, in keeping with his own admonition; nevertheless, it expressed a very definite viewpoint, or could perhaps be taken as expressing a very definite viewpoint, on two of the major political issues in this country. Reading his speech in conjunction with speeches by members of his party, whom I heard over the radio the same night, I should expect that his address had been prepared after some consultation with various members of his party in parliament.

Hon. Mr. Haig: No, no, none whatever.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Well, at least he reflected the same viewpoint as they did. I will put it that way.

Hon. Mr. Haig: I was only thinking a little faster than they were.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: That simply confirms my view that my honourable friend is the