

taking place, only one will attend, and he has nothing else to do.

I repeat my earlier suggestion that we should refrain from interfering with political questions. By and large, I think, all of us, regardless of political leanings, favour this broad approach, and as I said before, it has been my experience that we have acted in the best interests of this country.

Hon. Mr. Euler: My honourable friend has quoted someone as saying that he believed the Senate should be a delaying body.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Macdonald said it.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Does he believe that the Senate should indefinitely obstruct legislation which comes from the other house?

Hon. Mr. Haig: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Or would he approve of having some such restrictions as can be applied, for instance, by the Parliament of Great Britain?

Hon. Mr. Haig: My point is this. Let us suppose that during the excitement of war an election were held, and that a majority holding opinions of a certain kind were elected to the House of Commons and then the war suddenly ended. Often a war government is different from a peacetime government. Assuming that legislation proposed by a wartime government was such as we believed was not in the interests of Canada, we would not delay its application forever, but we might delay it a year or two. I will give an illustration. Some years ago the government of the day brought in a Foreign Exchange Control Bill which was intended to remain in effect indefinitely. I had a fear at that time that the Commonwealth Co-operative Federation might become the government of this country.

Hon. Mr. Howard: You have changed your mind since.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Oh, yes. Or rather, the facts made me change my mind. I was then, and still am, of the opinion that under the Foreign Exchange Control Act a government could direct the economy of this country without having recourse to parliament for any legislation at all. What did we do? It will be remembered that my honourable friend from Wellington (Hon. Mr. Howard) was quite active in the matter, and I give him credit for it. We said to the government: "Why not restrict the operation of this bill to two, or not more than three years? If the need for controls should remain in existence after that time, we shall be just as ready to face it then as we are now." The then government, after consideration, accepted our viewpoint, and so amended the

law. It is action of that kind which I have in mind when I speak of our "delaying" function; and Macdonald, Brown and Cartier were all in favour of the second chamber exercising this function.

I want to say just one word about the leader's speech. He made five or six points of the nature of suggestions. Every one of them, excepting that relating to retirement at a certain age, could be carried out without any further legislation. There is nothing to prevent us from doing any of these things that we want to do. But I do not think we should appoint a committee to consider them. I can see no possibility of such a committee giving us any help at all. That may be merely a personal opinion. I have outlined the purposes of our existence as a Senate and defined our fundamental duty, and that is all that we senators ought to try to do, unless we can show—and I do not think we can—that the Fathers of Confederation were wrong in their concept of what the Senate should be.

Further, I think that anybody who wants changes in the legislation dealing with the Senate of Canada should put forth some definite indications of what they find wrong. They say, "Oh, well, there's a lot of fellows there who could not be elected." But more members of this Senate have been elected to parliament than anybody has any idea of. When I came here this house contained sixty-five former members of the House of Commons and sixteen ex-members of legislatures; only sixteen were men and women who had not been members either of some provincial legislature or of the House of Commons. I think that is a pretty good record.

Secondly, it may be said that some of us—and perhaps I am one—are not too clever or active; that we have not made good business men or doctors or merchants or artisans, or whatever our vocations may be; but I believe that this membership will bear comparison with any cross-section of Canada and any legislative body one cares to name.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Haig: I would not want to sit in this chamber if all the senators were supermen and superwomen. I do not know what would happen. I want to sit with a body of men and women who comprise a good cross-section of the Canadian people.

I do not believe in any limit of age. If a senator is to retire at the age of seventy-five, some provision for superannuation will be necessary. My own experience—and I suppose it is shared by every doctor and lawyer in the house—is that when one is in a personal business one sees people walking by