

Before I go on to new ground, I want to refer to one of the Rules of the Senate which so far the Rules Committee has not done anything about. Here I refer to the attendance rule, under which senators are checked into this chamber as so many reluctant schoolboys "who creep unwillingly to school." Do not mistake me. I have no objection to a record of attendance being kept as such, because the attendance record of this Senate has consistently run over 71 per cent at all times; but I do object to the deduction of \$120 a day from a senator's indemnity if he misses more than 21 sittings in a year. In a time when the Senate met during a period of three or four months at the outside, this exemption may have been adequate, even generous, but in a time when the Senate has been meeting over 10 months, and in one session over a period of 14 months, this exemption is not enough.

Here I wish to emphasize something else which I consider important. Most members of this chamber had been very active in the public affairs of their home communities before being summoned to the Senate. In fact, one of the compelling reasons why they were appointed to the Senate was the contribution they had been making to the public affairs of their home communities and provinces. I hold the view that these men are better informed and more effective senators if they continue to discharge those public responsibilities after they come to the Senate. Most of these are non-remunerative but time-consuming services, such as participation in municipal councils, school boards, boards of governors of universities, and a whole host of similar public responsibilities. I consider it important that a senator should continue to participate in these activities, providing he does not do so to the neglect of his duties in the Senate, but I think it would be most unfair that in order for him to discharge those responsibilities it should cost him \$120 on top of such other expenses as he may be put to when doing that work.

Let me make one other point which the press frequently overlooks when speaking about parliamentary indemnities, as they frequently do. There are very few members of this house who would not be earning twice, three times or more than their current remuneration if they had remained in private life. And just for good measure, it should not go unnoticed that the American Congress has just raised the salaries or indemnities of their members to \$42,500. In addition, American Congressmen are provided with staff,

research and other services worth 20 times the value of similar services provided to Canadian parliamentarians. As a matter of fact, the quality of resources in the way of office facilities, equipment and staff which is provided by the Parliament of Canada for its members would compare unfavourably with most third-rate offices in the business world.

The Special Committee on the Rules of the Senate stated that their study had established the clear necessity for constitutional and statutory changes beyond the terms of reference of the committee in order to reach the objective of a modern and streamlined parliament. In this emphasis they were quite correct and it is hoped that their representations will fall on receptive ears in the centre of the parliamentary power structure—the Prime Minister's office. As a matter of fact, we have reason to believe that such matters are very much in the minds of those who will engage in the forthcoming Constitutional Conference next month.

You will recall that at the Constitutional Conference last year, Prime Minister Pearson referred to the desirability of reforming the Senate in such a way that it could perform its function more expeditiously and effectively. In the Speech from the Throne, opening this 28th Parliament, reference was made to the matter of Senate reform as one of the issues to be discussed with the provinces.

At this time I would like to emphasize that in the beginning the Senate was constituted and justified as a second arm of Government charged with the special responsibilities of guaranteeing the rights of minorities and giving some protection to regional needs and priorities. The Senate has some things to its credit in these fields, but I think an objective assessment of the Senate's role would indicate that historically we have not lived up to the expectations of the Fathers of Confederation. Not because of a lack of desire on the part of the Senate, but because of the manner of Senate appointments, it could not possibly deal effectively with those minority rights of language and customs and regional economic problems.

For example, since 1935 there has been no appointment to the Senate representing the viewpoint of the Government of the Province of Alberta. From 1943 to 1963 there was no appointment from the Province of Saskatchewan which represented the viewpoint of the provincial government of that period. From 1952 to the present time there has been no