

has been said that brevity is the soul not only of wit but of wisdom, I shall try to govern myself accordingly.

I wish at the outset to compliment the newly-elected senator for Newfoundland (Hon. Mr. Pratt) who spoke so ably in this house on Thursday last. Mrs. Grant and I visited Newfoundland two years ago, and we returned home with many pleasant memories of the good nature, humour and hospitality of the people of that wonderful province. I wish also to extend my sincere congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The address of the mover was very interesting, educational and persuasive; indeed, had one not known better, one might have been led to believe that Alberta is a finer province than Prince Edward Island. I read the address of the seconder; and, having listened in the past twenty years or more to many speeches on similar occasions, I am convinced that it is up to the highest standard of addresses of this kind.

Perhaps, on account of my age and waning ambition, I did not come into the Senate with any intention of taking a hand at reforming it. But I should like to repeat something which I have said on several occasions—that it is a shame that the Speaker and his lady should be obliged to stand for hours shaking hands with the hundreds of people who attend their receptions. The practice has come down, I suppose, from the days when there were no chairs, and people either sat on the ground or stood up. Surely this primitive practice might be changed by providing cushioned chairs and nice footstools so that the Speaker and his wife could shake hands in comfort with people as they pass by.

Though I do not want to discuss the reform of the Senate, because on this occasion it might be a little premature, let me say now that I am absolutely opposed to the principle of an elective Senate.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Grant: I shall give at least two reasons for this. For the past twenty-five years I have been running elections in the interest of the Liberal party; and for ten years previously, I was secretary-treasurer of the party in my district. I succeeded in making the county pretty safe for the Liberal party, and I enjoyed the work very much, although I lost a great deal of time. However, I was young then. But just one year before my last election the Conservatives very wisely persuaded my old opponent, whom I was accustomed to defeating, to retire. I understand they promised to put him in the Senate if their party gained power. He was a good man, and well worthy of the distinction. My new

opponent was a young man, a native of my constituency, and a member of one of the very best families. His word is as good as his bond in any part of the province. He is an honest lawyer.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Hooray!

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Grant: Were I in trouble I would engage him as my lawyer. However, he was nominated to run against me, and while I was here in Ottawa at the session he was going all over the county organizing and preparing for the election. To make a long story short, although he did not defeat me, he cut my small majority in half and sent me to bed for three months.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Anyway, he was an honest man!

Hon. Mr. Grant: He was a good man. I ask, what condition would I have been in following that experience, to fight an election contest against such an opponent for a seat in the Senate. The elective principle might have worked well for the Conservative party had it been in effect at the time.

I do not want to occupy too much time with personal references, but I should like to mention, by way of illustrating my point, the name of John R. MacNicol. No better representative of any party ever occupied a seat in the other place. Mr. MacNicol ran elections all his adult life; and it seems strange to me that in 1935 the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, knowing that he was going to be defeated, did not find a place for Mr. MacNicol in the Senate. At the last election Mr. MacNicol was defeated by a man in his twenties. It is not impossible that Mr. MacNicol's defeat hastened his death: had he been appointed to the Senate he might have been alive today, serving with us as one of our finest and ablest members.

I repeat that to my mind the elective principle is unfair. We cannot go as fast as these young fellows. They can do more canvassing in a week than we could do in a month. I am reminded of an incident which occurred while I was in the other place. Two Social Credit members occupied seats side by side at the same desk. One of these men was a tall fellow; the other, a short man, was the wittiest member of the house. Last year I noticed that the tall member was no longer in his old seat, and one day, while at the post office, I met the shorter man and asked him, "Where is your chum? Is he not here?" He replied, "No, he is not here." I said, "Did he run?" "Yes", was the answer "he ran, but he didn't run fast enough."

To tell the truth, I was pretty glad to be transferred into the Senate. My feelings are