

given that the suggested amendments would remain subject to review periodically to insure the continued betterment and improvement of the Senate.

The Senate has, of its own choosing, received the recommendations made by the special committee, which considers them to be an improvement over what we had in the past. The recommendations represent a step forward in the right direction so that we may be of greater service to Canadians and provide for their better welfare. Unless we can improve on these conclusions, and possibly be even bolder, the only choice open to me is to support, as I did in the committee, all the recommendations made by Senator Molson on behalf of the committee.

May I be permitted to add a few other observations. It is also my belief that some of the Senate customs based on tradition should be analyzed and possibly streamlined. There could be token traditional gestures, but we should now think of rendering all our sittings highly functional. We have much more to do and we need to find ways of eliminating some of the time-consuming customs based on the *esprit de grandeur* that do not now have much place in our democracy.

It is my belief that the Royal Assent procedure as it is now known should be discarded. It results in lost time for every member of both houses and for the senior officials involved. Its abolition would make no practical difference to anyone and no one would feel affected after the first emotional involvement based on maintaining forever old and revered customs. To me it would be more like the dropping of some unimportant brainwashing habits that no longer have a place in our thinking. Respect would be commanded by other means and through personal behaviour. For all I care, the custom of bowing from all parts of the chamber could also be dropped or be considerably simplified, without doing damage to our real feelings for the Throne or its representatives.

I would add that the prayer, as now written, is *passé* and should be revised. It too is time-consuming. We know that it could be revised to conform with the more modern procedures that we wish established everywhere, and that could be done by the religious authorities themselves.

I feel that the attendance of senators at caucuses is not too healthy a custom. To some it may provide a means of understanding

direction to follow in appreciating the bills before the Senate, and to others it may be a real form of continued brainwashing. If it were dropped, in my opinion the Senate would feel healthier and more realistic.

It is my belief that senators could be used with great advantage as representatives in discussions with other countries. Senators could be used for the closer control and analysis of foreign aid and the avoidance of waste effort and expenditures in foreign aid. Foreign aid has become one of the principal activities of our government and the Senate should play its part in that field. I may on some other occasion deal with some of the present thinking in this connection.

It has been said that the Senate should consider having more bills originate in this Chamber. I agree with that too. I must here re-state that during the last session of the 27th Parliament, 42 per cent of the bills introduced in both houses originated in the Senate. I must restate here though that during the last session of the 27th Parliament 42 per cent of the bills introduced in both houses originated in the Senate, exclusive of the private bills and divorce bills as we know them. There are 102 members in our house, and 265 members in the other house. The attendance at all Senate sittings stands remarkably high. I believe it compares well with the other place, and very well with senates of other countries.

We have, I believe, fared well, although we have in the Senate less than 40 per cent of the representatives found in the other place. There is great wisdom here, but we find a disappearing quality—prudence. We have a cross-section of successful Canadians in all fields of endeavour. We are paid, as we all know, less than the members of the other place. We can accept it without emotional involvement, and we also qualify well by our attendance at the sittings. We do not speak having in mind the winning of a few regional votes, but for what we believe is in the real interest of a greater and more prosperous Canada. Is that not something for a country like Canada? Is this what some would like to see abolished or destroyed?

I am sorry we had to learn through the press about the progressive reports on the studies by the Continuing Committee of the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference, made up of civil servants representing the federal and provincial governments. This committee has prepared a series of reports