

appointment from the Province of British Columbia which represented the viewpoint of the government of that province. To say this is not to reflect on the excellent representation that has come from those provinces in those years, but in my judgment the alienation of the western viewpoint, which that situation represents, has weakened Confederation and has contributed in some measure to a feeling of disunity.

One could go on and expand on the feelings of the Province of Quebec, because it too feels that its role as an important minority has not had the consideration it deserves.

These are facts of life as Canada approaches a major constitutional discussion with the provinces, and all Canadians must recognize that we must strengthen all of those factors in our political life which make for unity, equity and understanding. Reform of the Senate will not alone achieve this purpose, but it could be a significant start in giving the provinces a feeling that they have a greater role to play in formulating the programs and policies that affect all Canadians.

In January 1958 I was asked by a well-known Canadian daily newspaper to give my views on Senate reform. I did at that time, and I think those remarks are pertinent to today's discussion, so I am going to give them to you, with some slight modifications made necessary by the lapse of time.

In the beginning of that article I dealt with some of the current myths about the Senate. In view of the fact that those myths are still being perpetuated by people who should know better, I am going to quote some of them.

First, there is the myth to the effect that all a senator has to do is to take his seat in the Senate once during the session, collect his \$10,000—and now it is \$15,000—and go off to Florida. It is true he may take his seat in the Senate once and go off wherever he likes, even to Toronto, but he does not draw his pay. If he misses more than 21 sittings of the Senate he is quite rightly docked, at that time \$60 a day, and now \$120 a day. Secondly, if he misses two consecutive sessions of the Senate, even because of illness, he loses his seat.

Then again, it was said by none other than my friend Norman Campbell of the *Ottawa Journal* on Friday, January 10, 1958, that:

...the Senate met for 15 minutes, examined Senator Pouliot's version of a new Canadian flag and then adjourned for the day.

Such things are frequently said. The clear implication there is that the senators then returned to their games of bridge, tiddly-winks or what-have-you. The truth was that that same day a committee of at least 25 senators put in an interesting and useful two hours examining, discussing and amending Bill L, dealing with the problems of the offshore boundaries and who owned the natural resources in the coastal waters of Hudson's Bay, Ungava Bay and a few other places. We could not have done our homework too well, because the proposition is not yet settled. That was the third meeting of that committee on that topic, and there have been others since.

Had he wanted to be fair, he could also have said that another group of senators spent some part of 40 to 50 days every session in some hole and corner basement rooms "enjoying" themselves in the Senate Divorce Committee. Thank goodness we are rid of that. Or he could have described the sessions of the Banking and Commerce Committee, the Committee on Trade Relations, or Transport and Communications, or any one of a number of others where honest, sincere and painstaking work continues to be done every year. But, of course, to admit such things would not be in keeping with the myth that the Senate is an expensive and useless appendage.

Then there is the myth that the Senate is inhabited by a lot of senile and decrepit old men—and women. Any adult person knows that chronological age has little to do with a man's mental age. Some men are old at 40, others are vigorous mentally at 70 or even 80. Two of the best speeches that I had heard in the Senate up to that time had been made by Senators Farris of Vancouver and Crerar of Winnipeg. They were 80. Their speeches were masterpieces of the spoken language; they were not read and they were delivered with style, conviction and vigour. Or, again, the participations of Senator Roebuck given extemporaneously and frequently, always examples of lucid expression and good form, yet at that time he was in his eightieth year. These are examples of exceptional and able men, but there are many such in the Senate.

There were at that time six women in the Senate, all of whom would fall into that comprehensive and gracious age bracket that we chivalrous men call "mature," but I can unhesitatingly say that the women members of the Senate are a credit to the women of