

only could not accomplish this purpose. There emerged 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.

5. Such basic reform is not a new idea. Over the years, the Senate itself has struggled with this problem. One can recall the motion placed before this Chamber in 1951 by the Hon. Wishart McL. Robertson, then Government Leader in the Senate,

“that a Special Committee of the Senate be appointed to inquire into, and report upon, whatever action in its opinion may be necessary or expedient to enable the Senate to make its maximum contribution to the welfare of the Canadian people.”

But today the problem is more urgent because of the rapid social change during the last two decades. Parliamentary reform is now a public issue which must be resolved with dispatch in accordance with the requirements of modern society.

6. The British North America Act, 1867, contemplated a primary role for the Senate which has changed substantially over the years. Originally it was envisaged that all legislation would originate in the House of Commons and that the function of the Senate would be to re-examine the Bills passed by the House and referred to the Senate. It was to be a Chamber for review and “sober second thought”.

7. With the passage of time this function has changed. In the first place many private bills have been introduced in the Senate, particularly of course divorce bills. It appears generally agreed that all private bills ought to be introduced in the Senate, whereas for special reasons a few private bills are still being introduced in the House of Commons. That conclusion was implicit in the decision taken in 1932 to increase the parliamentary fee to \$500 if a private bill were introduced in the Commons while it was left at the less realistic figure of \$200 if introduced in the Senate. A provision to the effect that all private bills shall originate in the Senate would be beyond the competence of the Senate acting unilaterally. It is recommended therefore that discussions be initiated with the House of Commons to the end that such a provision be made either by a change in the rules of the House of Commons or by statute. If that change is made, presumably the parliamentary fee in the Senate should be raised too. In addition,

it has become the practice to introduce a limited number of government bills—those with no money context—in the Senate. This practice, which is a very welcome one, has enabled the Senate to carry part of the legislative load in recent years, as the following data reveals:

Year	Government Bills initiated in the Senate	Government Bills initiated in the Commons	Percentage of Total initiated in the Senate
1957-58	3	28	10%
1958	4	41	9
1959	12	44	21
1960	13	37	26
1960-61	6	58	9
1962	1	26	4
1962-63	1	18	5
1963	8	48	14
1964-65	19	44	30
1965	5	13	28
1966-67	22	81	21
1967-68	19	26	42

8. When it is borne in mind that all money bills are included in the figures of Bills initiated in the Commons, it becomes apparent that the Senate can carry a not inconsequential share of the legislation when the Government of the day directs Bills to it for introduction. It might be added that during the last ten years 233 Private Bills, other than Divorce Bills, have been initiated in the Senate, while only 4, initiated in the House of Commons, have been received by the Senate.

9. Another innovation, the function of investigation, has been most effectively carried out by special committees of the Senate, and often at a fraction of the cost that would have been incurred by a Royal Commission. More and more the work of Parliament has to be done in Committees. This is true also in other countries with democratic forms of government, including the United Kingdom and the United States. Over and above its deliberative functions the Senate, in carrying out its primary responsibility as a legislative body, must do an increasing amount of investigatory and research work. Examples of this are to be found in recent years in the work of the Special Committees such as those on (1) Inflation, (2) Manpower and Employment, (3) Land Use in Canada, (4) Aging, (5) The Joint Committee on Consumer Credit and (6) The Joint Committee on Divorce, and the current intensive study being made by the Special Committee on Science Policy. Such studies