

entourage might trip and fall over the holes in the old rug. So we got a new and splendid one, the one we now have.

It required foresight to ask for the cleaning of the walls and the panels, better light, improved acoustics, and a new carpet. These things came just in time; for every honourable senator would have been ashamed to have had Her Majesty attend the opening of the Senate in its former condition.

Some of our colleagues have suggested the building of new galleries, and a subcommittee has been set up to consider this matter. With respect to the repairs which have been made I must pay a special tribute to the late Government, and especially to the former Minister of Public Works, the Honourable Robert Winters, who considered favourably all the suggestions which were made to him by the subcommittee which dealt with this subject.

I have spoken of suggestions made by several members to improve the physical appearance of the Senate, but there is something else which is very important, and which I draw to the attention of new senators whose support in this matter I hope to have in due course. It is directed to the spiritual reform of the Senate. I am not now commenting on the Speech from the Throne: that may come later. What I am now going to say is that no government in the world can reform the Senate; that is something which must be done by honourable senators themselves, and it can be done in only one way, namely by amending our rules. Those rules were made thirty years ago, which means they are nearly as antiquated as the worn-out rug. They must be reformed. We have to distribute the work of the Senate in such a manner that each honourable senator is given an opportunity to share in the work of this body and to give to it the full measure of his capacities. It is a very simple problem, and one way to deal with it is to make good use of a rule which concerns the Committee of the Whole. Although I have not been a member of this honourable body for very long, I have deeply lamented that, in spite of the provision in the standing orders, all legislation is not brought before the Committee of the Whole. My reason for insisting that this course should be followed is that each honourable senator is a member of the Committee of the Whole, and the Leader of the Government has the opportunity of inviting any member of the cabinet who sponsors a piece of legislation in the other house to come here and explain it, thus giving an opportunity to all honourable senators to ask questions of the Leader of the Government and his cabinet colleague who introduced the bill in the other

chamber. Another advantage is that all the discussions between honourable senators and any cabinet minister who, by special privilege, sits with us are recorded in *Hansard*.

Now, why was the Narcotic Control Bill referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce at the last session? Was it because those who indulge in the traffic of those drugs make so much money that they have big bank accounts? I object to such bills being sent to that committee. It was agreed between the leaders thirty years ago that we should have as few meetings as possible of the Committee of the Whole, and that nearly every bill should be sent to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

I have an inquiry on the Order Paper which I hope will be answered in the near future. I want to know how many meetings our various committees have held during each of the last ten sessions. I will draw the attention of honourable senators to the answer that will come in due course and they will see that several committees have not sat at all. I remember when I was in the House of Commons I was chairman of a special Parliamentary Committee on Civil Service. That committee had some very well-informed members on it. One of them later became Minister of Public Works and is now serving on the Bench of the Exchequer Court. I think there should be a permanent Committee on Civil Service in the House of Commons. Why? To prevent favouritism and to give an opportunity to each civil servant to place his grievances before Parliament and under the protection of Parliament. This would give all the rank and file of civil servants protection against the despotism of some bureaucratic chiefs or assistant chiefs. This idea has never been accepted.

In any event the Senate Committee on Civil Service Administration has not been sitting for many years, even though there have been changes in the Civil Service Commission. It is an internal committee that deals with civil service positions. That is an absurdity. I hope that the Senate Committee on Civil Service Administration will be raised from its ashes and used for the protection of civil servants. This is my hope. I have nothing to say about the new board of the civil service because I do not know its members, but having been a member of the House of Commons for a very long time I do know that one of the most helpful gentlemen in the civil service was Mr. Stanley G. Nelson, former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Why do I say that? It is because he was endowed with that quality