

followed. However, I would thank him on behalf of all of us for the able and complete reference he has made to these gentlemen whom we all knew so well.

I am reminded, as always at a time such as this, that it is a little more difficult for the Opposition leader who is the second speaker to make full reference to those who have passed on, because the historical facts have already been enumerated. And there are many notable things to be said about our departed colleagues, all of whom have had outstanding lives. One reason why we think so much of the Senate is that it is made up of men and women of wide ability and experience, which they bring to the work of this chamber. The members of this house represent a breadth of knowledge and experience not possessed by any other body in this country. That was particularly true of the men whom we are speaking about this afternoon.

I first want to say a word or two about Senator Hackett. Naturally I liked John Hackett. Soon after he came here he and I had quite a discussion upstairs about our names. I mentioned that I did not like my second name and he said, "That is an insult to me." I asked, "How do you make that out?" He replied, "That is my second name". I then said, "Well, let me have your first name, and I will give you my second name in return, so we will be fifty-fifty."

John Hackett was the type of man whom Canadians admire. They will always remember him for the great contribution that he made to the progress of this country. In this chamber we are always happy when a man of his ability and experience thinks enough of his country to devote his time and service to public affairs. I might say that the hardest problem which a democratic country has is that of getting men and women of experience and ability to devote themselves to the public service—and that is easily understood, for in doing so they make a very great sacrifice. I have been in this chamber for quite a number of years and I speak from experience in this matter. I know, as I think everyone here does, that regardless of the salary or indemnity that we receive as members of this house, if the same energy and industry that we apply here were applied to one's own business the return would be far greater. All of us are delighted when a man of the ability and character of the late Senator Hackett consents to devote his talents and ability and his heart to the life and progress of our country.

Senator Hackett was a native son of the province of Quebec, an English-speaking son who could speak French as a Frenchman

speaks it. He interpreted the English-speaking people to the French-speaking people of Quebec as nobody else could, and he interpreted the English-speaking people of Quebec to the people of the other provinces.

I say to his widow—I knew her well—and to his children, two of whom I met and knew, that we miss his going, but we congratulate them on having had a husband and father who made such an immense contribution to the life of his country.

I came to know the late Senator Godbout after he entered this house. I knew his record and I liked Senator Godbout. I could go over to his desk, wherever he happened to be sitting, which latterly was just across the aisle from where I am, and ask him about something and he would promise to attend to it. No letter from him was needed to confirm that promise: I knew he would carry it out to the letter, in an even better way than I could suggest. He was a scientific agriculturist, a practical farmer who had gained in the course of his life great agricultural experience, which he shared widely, not only with his own province but with the rest of Canada. The farmers of our country are greatly indebted to him for the contribution he made to the agricultural progress of Canada. I did not know his family, but I say to them that they are honoured in having a husband and father who has left such a heritage to his country, for scientific agriculture is the essence of agricultural development in Canada.

I would now like to say a few words about the late Senator Stevenson. Honourable senators, I served on the Divorce Committee for many years with John Stevenson, and I think that if he had had his way there would not have been a single divorce granted by Parliament, provided he could get the man and wife together and convince them to go on living together and be happy. The question of divorce worried him more than it did most of us. I could name some other members who did not seem to worry a bit about it, but it did worry him. His own family life had been so happy so delightful, that he felt very keenly that other people should be happy too.

Senator Stevenson was a great personal help to me when I came down here. I liked him very much. His was a name that was loved in Saskatchewan, so much so that whenever criticism was levelled at the Senate and some disparaging remarks made, the people of Saskatchewan would only retort that the Senate must be a mighty fine place so long as John Stevenson was a member