

Hon. Mr. Haig: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: I suggested in the telegram that they might not come if they felt they did not want to. Of course, I could not tell them not to come. I know the Leader of the Opposition appreciated that, as did other senators.

We have taken it upon ourselves to repose in the Speaker of the Senate the responsibility of calling back the Senate during an adjournment if an emergency should arise prior to the date fixed for our reassembling. That has been done in certain instances, always after the Speaker has consulted with the Leader of the Government.

Honourable senators, it occurs to me that next session the motion might be widened so that His Honour the Speaker, after consultation with the Leader of the Government, could extend the date of adjournment.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Let us suppose that we adjourned for two weeks, and at the end of the two weeks there was no business, why could not the Speaker, after consultation, extend that date for another week? I make that suggestion for what it is worth, with a view to meeting the convenience of honourable senators, and so that I may not be accused of having them sit here longer than they actually should.

Hon. Mr. Hackett: May I say to the honourable gentleman that the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) was very definite in saying that he was not criticizing the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), and in saying so I think he spoke for everybody. The courtesy and kindness of the Leader of the Government is beyond criticism, and I am quite certain that the Leader of the Opposition made it clear that he was not criticizing him.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: I am sure of that. At any rate, when I made reference to the house sitting too long I intended it to be in a jocular tone. I hope the Leader of the Opposition did not take my remark too seriously, for it was far from my mind to make such a suggestion seriously.

However, I wish to make a comment on his statement that more legislation should be introduced by this house. I agree with him; but I feel that I should point out that under our Constitution money bills, as they are called, cannot be introduced in the Senate, as the Leader of the Opposition has said. Some day I think that might be changed; at least, that is a question which we might consider. If that were done more bills could be introduced here. However, I have made every

effort to have bills introduced here which did not have a money question, and if the legislation of this session is reviewed I think it will be found that, probably with one exception, all bills which were not money bills have been introduced in this house.

Hon. Mr. Power: What about the bill to promote equal pay for female employees, and also the act to amend the Indian Act, which were debated here this morning?

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Both those bills have a money content.

Hon. Mr. Power: Have they?

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Oh, yes. The bill to promote equal pay for female employees certainly has a money content. That is true also of the Public Service Superannuation Act and the Indian Act.

Hon. Mr. Haig: The Small Loans Act could not have been introduced here.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: The Leader of the Opposition is right, I think, in saying that the Small Loans Bill could not have been introduced here. I do not think there was a money content in the Telegraphs Bill, which was introduced in the other house; but by and large there are few Government bills which have not quite a substantial money content.

Honourable senators, I will take the advice of the Leader of the Opposition and continue to have as many bills as possible introduced here.

Hon. Mr. Hackett: As early as possible.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Yes, I shall introduce as many bills as possible here and as early as possible; but I doubt if in any session a larger proportion of the total number of bills can be introduced in the Senate than have been introduced here this session.

The Leader of the Opposition also rather blamed the Government for taking so long with its bills in the other house. I think if he will read the Commons *Hansard* he will find that it was the Opposition that took the time over there, if he will add up the columns of speeches made by Government members he will find them to be few compared with those filled by speeches made by the Opposition members. I do not accuse the Opposition of holding up bills, but if bills have been delayed I contend that the delay was not occasioned by the Government. I do not like to have either the other house or this house accused of holding up bills. Parliament is a place where there should be full discussion, and I think we should not look too critically at either house when considerable time is spent in dealing with legislation.