

this bill which he is introducing intended to be what I might call a test bill or a "guinea pig" bill? If it is found that this method of introducing legislation is sound, will we have any greater number of bills before the Senate in addition to the one which he hopes to bring in at this time? If this were the case the main justification for a bill of this kind would be that it is going to increase the work of the Senate. We are very anxious to increase our work. There is no reason why these bills should not be presented here, except that under our present rules it appears this cannot be done. If we can circumvent the rules and have more business, that is all to the good. If we cannot do it that way, perhaps some amendment could be made. In my view the Senate should have more work to do, and I congratulate the Leader of the Senate on his efforts to provide more work.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): My friend asks if this is what he calls a "guinea pig" bill—

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Let us say a test bill.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):—or a test bill. In view of the precedents in 1947 and 1949, it is obvious that the Canadian Senate has already adopted the practice that is probably applicable here. I took advantage of the opportunity this evening to speak about another practice that has grown up in the House of Lords which might very well be a useful device for this body to use, and which might have the effect also of permitting more legislation to be introduced here. I refer to what has been called the "privileged insertion."

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Were these bills you mention, the two in the Senate of Canada and the two in the House of Lords, questioned at all? Was there any objection made to them or any debate as to whether they were constitutional or not?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I think it was quite clear in the two Canadian precedents that the committee refused to consider the bills with the financial clause and struck them out knowing what the result would be.

So far as the action of the House of Lords on the Commonwealth Secretariat bill is concerned, they knew there were financial implications, but it was a good bill, and the House of Commons at that time was loaded down with legislation after the Prime Ministers' Conference. This was the device they

used, and it was a useful one. The important point to keep in mind, however, is that it was not a matter of the rules of either house which enabled it to be done. It has been done a number of times and as a result a practice has developed. I suggest that practice is sound.

Coming now to this particular bill, I simply regard it as an opportunity for introducing another piece of legislation in the Senate. I was happy to have four pieces to introduce to the Senate when it returned this evening. I felt there was a likelihood that when the Senate met here this evening it would simply be for the purpose of adjourning, and I do not think that is as it should be. I would fail in my duty as a member of the Senate, having a seat in the cabinet and being on the legislation committee of the cabinet, if I did not do all I could to get every new piece of legislation possible for introduction in the Senate in the first instance.

Hon. Jean-François Pouliot: Honourable senators, there is nothing I enjoy more than free discussion between the two leaders of this house. The Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Connolly, Ottawa West) has opened the window and a gust of fresh air has come in to blow off the dust that covers the rules which we call the Standing Orders. I think it is high time to simplify the rules of both houses. There are some who have been posing as experts. One of the experts in the House of Commons published big books which were made with scissors, Pepper and glue—the scissors to cut quotations from other books; Pepper was the messenger who used the scissors, and the glue was used to paste the clippings onto galleys which were sent to the printer who in turn published a big, thick book.

While our rules do not date back exactly to the Magna Carta, they originated shortly afterwards when there was a quarrel between the bigger and smaller barons. It is from that time that we have two separate Houses of Parliament. Everybody knows this; I am not telling you anything that is highly technical. I am trying to bring you back to the establishment of two houses. However, there is no quarrel now between the Senate and the House of Commons.

I hope honourable senators will excuse me if I use the phrase "House of Commons" instead of "the other place". "The other place" could mean a store on Sparks Street or a hotel in town. I find it ridiculous that we