

The questions arising out of food resources and the population explosion in the world were also debated with knowledge and authority by many of the delegates.

Honourable senators, I am speaking too lengthily, but there are some things that need to be said if we are to have an appreciation in this country and in this Parliament of some of the problems that exist in the Commonwealth which, if solved even in part, can mean so much to peace and security in the world.

This year we tried an innovation, a Canadian initiative. Instead of having speeches made only in plenary session, we resorted to the device used in the I.P.U. and the NATO Parliamentarians organization, of breaking up into committees. One committee, dealing with parliamentary institutions in the modern world, sat in this chamber under the chairmanship of the Honourable C.A. Thomasos, of Trinidad and Tobago. It was an interesting discussion, and you will find it throughout the debate in various places. I hope to assist honourable senators who might be interested in reading the part of the committee work, dealing with second chambers by referring to some of the people and mentioning the pages where their speeches appear.

The references to a second chamber at page 109 by Mr. Rowe of Australia, and at page 112 by Sir William McDonald of Australia, describe the elective upper house or second chamber in their country.

I am indebted to our colleague Senator Hugessen, because he undertook the task at my instance, for a most enlightening speech in this particular committee on the work and functioning of the Senate of Canada. If I may say so, it was one of the best contributions to the work of that committee. Senator Hugessen's remarks are reported at page 118.

At page 122, Mr. Cheeks of Guyana told why there is not a Senate in his country.

At page 126, Mr. Gordon, the leader of the New Zealand delegation, told why they abolished the Senate there in 1950.

At page 128 Mr. Durga Das Khanna of India emphasized the importance of the second chamber and why in his view the Indian system of electing the members was desirable.

Senator Machio of Kenya said that in his country, a small country, they will probably abolish the Senate some day.

Finally, although he was not expected to appear, and normally does not appear, everyone was delighted with the fact that Senator Fulbright took enough interest in this debate to go to this committee and talk about the working of the United States Senate. This was a gesture that was received with warmth by the members of the committee; his contribution was a very good one indeed. This was the first time that a United States delegate—and they only attend as observers—has ever been permitted to participate in the debate, except on international affairs. The larger countries—and those countries which, like ours, are federal states—generally feel that second chambers are of immense importance and value. There are various ways in which second chambers are constituted.

In the smaller countries the experience is somewhat analogous to the experience of the provinces of Canada, which abolished their legislative chambers, one by one, Quebec now being the only province which has retained a second chamber.

Considerable discussion arose also on the problems of the lower house, on the procedures of the lower house, and on the work of committees. Speeches were made on the importance and value of Parliament, on the sacredness of this institution.

The conclusions of that committee, as given in its report, are to be found at page 307 of the Official Report:

Consensus

A United Kingdom delegate, in closing the debate, remarked that three threads have run through the discussion:

1. Some modification or reform is needed to bring parliamentary institutions up-to-date;

2. A pattern suitable for one part of the Commonwealth would not necessarily be suitable for another part; each country must, while maintaining fundamental democratic principles, evolve its own parliamentary methods;

3. The committee system offers many advantages in meeting present-day demands of Legislatures and consideration could be given in many countries to developing it further.

I am particularly pleased at the reception which the committee received at the hands of delegates and at the enthusiasm with which they praised this Canadian initiative. It gave an opportunity for an exchange and inter-