

Senate to the country, even in those years when we have had two sessions, is only \$1,200,000. Compare that with a saving of \$26 million a year.

Hon. Mr. Euler: What about the \$600 million the western farmers lost on the wheat agreement?

Hon. Mr. Haig: The answer is that the Senate had already saved the money.

My honourable friend the leader had something to say about the reform of the Senate. I would point out that the late Mr. King at the convention of the Liberal party held in 1919, promised that the Senate would be reformed. Mr. King later said, I think in a jocular way, that he had certainly reformed the Senate. Of course it was not in the way that the resolution of the convention had meant it. Why did Mr. King not keep his promise? Well, if I were speaking on a political platform I might say that he had his tongue in his cheek when he made the promise, but I do not believe that is the answer. I firmly believe that if Mr. King had had any proposals to offer by way of making the Senate more useful to Canada, he would have made them. He was challenged time and again by the opposition in the House of Commons to explain why he had not kept his promise of 1919. I offer this explanation: when the promise was made he was a young man in political life, and that when he looked with more mature eyes at the constitution of the Senate and its record he had no proposals to offer for its improvement.

With one more point, I shall conclude.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: Go ahead; it is a good speech.

Hon. Mr. Haig: The honourable leader of the government has said that certain inquiries can be ably carried out by the Senate. I agree with him in part at least, but I warn the house, as I have often done before—and not because I think that the positions of the parties represented here will be changed—that our concern is to justify our existence by doing what confederation intended us to do. Above all we must keep in mind that we are Canadians before we are Grits or Tories.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Haig: A few sessions ago the Senate inquired into the workings of the Income Tax Act, and offered several amendments to it. Our suggestions were not implemented *in toto*, but practically all of the major recommendations we made are today part of the Income Tax law of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Quite true.

Hon. Mr. Haig: But I would strongly urge that we keep away from inquiring into political problems, for in so doing I think we would expose ourselves to the criticism that the Senate, an appointed body, was trying to oppose the wishes of the elected representatives of the people. We are appointed by the government to represent the people of Canada in a certain specific capacity, and we must be careful not to overstep our jurisdiction.

I have never yet met or talked to thinking people—except perhaps some college professors—who seriously advocated the abolition of the Senate; nor have I heard a *bona fide* suggestion that the Senate should be an elected body.

I call the attention of the honourable members to a report made by the late Senator Ross, in which he reviewed many of the statements made by such statesmen as Macdonald and Brown. There one may read the words of the Honourable George Brown—a liberal of Liberals—to the effect that there should not be two elected houses of parliament for the reason that there would be constant warfare between them. If we were elected for a term of five years what would be the attitude today of my colleagues and myself—towards a government measure that was contrary to policy of our party? Why, we would fight it to the bitter end. Men like the Honourable George Brown foresaw such a situation, and expressed themselves as opposed to an elected Senate. Sir John A. Macdonald's stand on the Senate was that it should be regarded as a delaying body. That is to say, if certain legislation was being passed too hastily, it was the function of this chamber to delay its passage.

I am bold to say that if the government of the day went to the country and, after a clear statement on the issues involved received the consent of the majority of the people to take certain action, I as a member of this house would not stand in the way of its implementation. History shows that all appointed bodies may contest certain measures, but that when these measures are shown to be the will of the people, resistance is withdrawn. Perhaps I can illustrate my point by calling attention to the practice that prevails in most organizations. When a past president is made an honorary member of an organization, he very seldom takes an active part in its functions. For instance, in the Province of Manitoba the practice of the Bar is to make all Benchers who have served for a period of fifteen years—of whom there are now fourteen—honorary Benchers. Our experience is that when the Secretary of the Bar Association informs these honorary Benchers that there is an important meeting