

carry an extra responsibility and in which perhaps his words will acquire even greater weight than they have had in the past from their intrinsic merit.

That really concludes my list of congratulations and kind words, of which in general Senator O'Leary spoke with such scorn, though he hastened, of course, to admit that he was transgressing his own rule.

I should like, however, to say also how much I look forward to the contribution that will be made by our two new senators from Nova Scotia. We have already had from Senator Cottreau an excellent speech seconding the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, a speech in which he has displayed—

[Translation]

... the distinctive qualities of the Acadian people in Nova Scotia.

[English]

I also enjoyed very much the distinguished speech—perhaps I have used that word too often tonight; shall I say, with Senator O'Leary, the extraordinary speech?—of Senator Neiman, moving the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It was a most refreshing change from the unending series of congratulations to a government which we usually get by the mover of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It was a critical speech. It was a critical speech in the proper sense of the term. It was a speech which showed the kind of independence of mind which should characterize members of this house on whichever side of the aisle they sit. It was not an attack upon the government, but it was, on the other hand, not simply one of those sugary, syrupy, saccharine hymns of praise of everything that the government says and does, which sometimes, I am afraid, one is apt to get, perhaps simply out of a sense of courtesy, from movers of Addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Senator O'Leary trailed his coat in all directions. I was greatly tempted to follow him in some of these directions. I was greatly tempted to take up his challenge to make this house more one of the cut and thrust of debate. However, time is getting on. I am notoriously loquacious. I remember when I first came in here that at a very early stage my friend Senator Croll, perhaps regretting that he was one of those who introduced me formally, said to me, "You are too verbose. You're too wordy." I have tried to bear his words in mind since and to restrain my natural loquacity, but I have to be very careful or my tongue will run away with me.

There are just two points on which I should like to follow up what Senator O'Leary said. One is his surprising objection to the introduction of bills in this house. The British North America Act clearly envisages the possibility of bills being introduced in this house, because it specifically says that money bills cannot be introduced in this house. By implication, therefore, it surely assumes that other bills can be and will be introduced in this house. I was the more surprised by Senator O'Leary saying this, because I distinctly remember—my memory for past political events is not as all-encompassing as Senator O'Leary's, nor as faithful, nor as accurate, but even within my limited memory I can distinctly recall—that in the days when Mr. Bennett was Prime Minister of Canada a

[Senator Forsey.]

very considerable number of very important bills were introduced first in this house. My recollection is that an enormous, vast, voluminous and extraordinarily complicated, important bill revising the Canada Shipping Act was introduced in this house and received most of its consideration in this house and a relatively small amount in the other house. I am not absolutely sure of that last, but I know it was introduced here and discussed here at great length, and went through most of the serious process of consideration here rather than in the other house and before the other house ever saw it at all.

I don't think there is anything demeaning to this house in initiating legislation. I don't think there is anything demeaning in our saving the time of the other house by considering here bills which are not controversial in a partisan sense but are perhaps rather technical. They may be controversial as between experts in a particular field. Here we have such a vast reservoir of experience and of particular expertise that it seems to me some of these bills can be most profitably, most valuably considered here, and the time of the House of Commons can be available for bills which are rather matters of acrid public controversy and partisan controversy. That is the kind of thing which the House of Commons more particularly exists for, and if we can do up here much of what you might call the technical work on more or less technical bills, often of enormous importance, then so much the better. I can't see anything wrong with that at all. I suppose you can say that in that case it is the sober first thought rather than the sober second thought; but I doubt very much whether Sir John A. Macdonald would have been prepared to go to the stake for the single adjective "second." I think he would have taken perfectly cheerfully the fact of the Senate dealing first with legislation, more particularly legislation of the kind I have indicated. I really must go and look up the precedents and see just how much Sir John A. Macdonald's governments used to introduce here in the first place. I suspect there was a great deal of legislation introduced here in the first place then, if only because, in the first cabinet after Confederation, of the 13 members, five were in this house, and most of them held portfolios; and down to 1896 every single portfolio in the cabinet, with the single exception of finance, had been held by a senator, including the premiership, as we all know, on two occasions. So I doubt very much whether Senator O'Leary's political theory on this subject would stand the test of historical investigation, but I may be wrong. Anybody who ventures to question Senator O'Leary on a matter of history is putting his head into the lion's jaws.

● (2050)

The other thing that Senator O'Leary said that I want to deal with very briefly was this business of Senate scrutiny of subordinate legislation—orders in council, and that sort of thing. All I have to say about that is that this is to be one of the functions of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments, and at this point I'm inclined to exclaim, *Hinc illae lacrimae*—"Hence these tears"—remembering all the trials and tribulations through which we passed as members of that committee last year. But I am happy to inform the house that once the committee is re-appointed, which I hope will be soon,