

My next point is still valid. I did not have very much support for it at the time I put it forward, and, in fact, some of my colleagues did not like the idea at all. The Special Committee on the Rules has suggested that senators should not attend the caucus. I am inclined to think the committee is right in that suggestion, and my proposal would help make up for that deficiency. I should like to see a sort of pseudo cabinet on the Government side in the Senate. This would be a group of men and/or women, each of whom would be a deputy for two or more departments of government in the other house. They would be men and/or women who worked closely with the cabinet ministers in the other place, and who would speak for them in the Senate. They would pilot through the Senate the bills received from their ministers in the House of Commons, and they would answer questions on those departments in the Senate.

One of the things that has concerned me during the years I have been a member of the Senate is the fact that the Leader of the Government in the Senate has a very heavy responsibility, because he is the man who has the duty of piloting all Government bills through the Senate. It is true that leaders of the government in the Senate—and this has applied to both political parties—have farmed out those bills to some extent, but I do not think such a procedure has achieved the purpose I have in mind.

The members of this pseudo cabinet would pilot through the Senate the bills emanating from their ministers in the other place, and they would answer questions on those departments in the Senate. To make sure there are lots of questions there should be a brief daily question period. Such an arrangement would make for more interesting work, and a better informed Senate.

Next I should like to see the Senate sit as a Committee of the Whole much more frequently, where in an informal atmosphere members could ask questions of ministers of the Crown, their deputies in the Senate, or other qualified people. If my memory serves me correctly, on only three occasions since I came here in 1955 has this house sat as a Committee of the Whole. The most recent occasion was, of course, when it considered the report of the Special Committee on the Rules, and at which time we had excellent discussions. The first of the three occasions I have in mind was when we discussed the famous pipe line bill. I see no denigration of the dignity of the Senate

in its sitting much more frequently as a Committee of the Whole.

We achieve some of the benefits of this practice in the present committees of the Senate, such as those on Finance, Banking and Commerce, and others, but I would like to see the same informality and the same interplay of minds in many more areas of the work of the Senate than we are getting at the present time. Such an arrangement would have a tendency to reduce the number of set speeches—in this respect I have been as guilty as anyone—and would make for a more informal and, I think, more effective and interesting type of debate.

I should like to see the procedures of the Senate so modified that it would sit for five days a week when in session rather than the present three or, at the most, four days a week. By sitting five days a week, even though this would necessitate some committees sitting concurrently, it would mean that the Senate could dispose of the business before it, and then adjourn until more legislation was ready. I believe this practice was followed in Senator Dandurand's day, and I think it could be reinstituted to the benefits of all concerned.

There are among the membership of the Senate some of the leading corporation lawyers, financiers, and businessmen of Canada—men who in their private capacities are playing a vital role in Canadian business. It seems to me that here is a source of skill and talent which could be effectively used for many of the investigations that are carried out by royal commissions. On some occasions, senators have been members of inquiries and commissions, and they have discharged their responsibilities with credit to themselves and their country. Much more use could be made of the Senate for such purposes, and the Senate's value to Parliament and the country would be enhanced.

In conclusion I would say that I have long felt that the Canadian Senate could adopt some of the procedures of the Senate of the United States. In this respect I am thinking particularly of the distinguished committees of the United States Senate, such as those on foreign affairs, banking and commerce, and others. Under our new rules our eight main committees can be of the magnitude and importance of their opposite numbers in the American Congress.

We are passing through troublous times, and the elements of dissension within the