

Committee, for the continued important work of the Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce under Senator Hayden, the Committee on Finance under Senator Leonard, and the Committee on Transportation and Communications under Senator Thorvaldson. The other standing committees will be far from idle.

The Senate, in my view, must maintain the momentum which has been building up gradually over the last ten or twelve years. The machinery of the Senate has been modernized, in spite of what critics sometimes allege: what remains now is to put this program into effective operation.

A busy man is usually a happy and a useful man. The same goes for institutions. We should not merely await initiatives from the Government or from the House of Commons. We ourselves can take initiatives, as a group, as individuals, advancing our views as to what courses should be followed by this body to make it more effective. There is indeed much to do and, if I may put it this way, there is little time in which to do it.

Apart from the rules themselves, I should refer to some features of the Fourth Report which, if acceptable to the Senate, will require follow-up action. The first major recommendation in the committee's report is to the effect that all private bills should originate in the Senate and that discussions "be initiated with the House of Commons to the end that such a provision be made either by a change in the Rules of the House of Commons or by statute." This is a suggestion with which I am in entire agreement. If it is equally acceptable to the Senate, ways and means of communicating the Senate's views to the House of Commons will have to be explored, following the conclusion of this debate. I should think that we would not want to waste much time in doing this.

A second recommendation made by the committee is to the effect that a greater number of non-money bills might usefully be introduced in the Senate. The trend, from the statistical table given in the report, has clearly been in that direction and concerns the statistical studies made by Professor Kunz in his book which appeared in 1963 entitled *The Modern Senate of Canada 1925-1963—A Re-appraisal*.

The decision as to the house in which a bill will be introduced is of course, under our system, made by the Government. I can only say that, in so far as it lies within my power,

I will endeavour to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of the legislative workload as between the two houses, and my colleagues in the Government share this view. In the result, the bills that we have been given the privilege of introducing or initiating here is consistent with the statistics of the last few years, and that will continue.

As to the recommendation of the committee that consideration be given to changing the concept of a money bill, I will have occasion to refer to that matter when I speak on the inquiry initiated by Senator Hayden. The recent instances mentioned by Senator Hayden a few days ago support the view that the practice has been tending—perhaps I should say "trending"—in the direction suggested by the committee. It may not be necessary to contemplate any formal action in this regard. My estimation is that the new concept mentioned by the committee will soon be established by practice—one of the three great streams of constitutional change—if indeed it has not already been so established.

The committee also gave consideration to the long list of statutes set out in Appendix A to its Fourth Report. I entirely agree that these statutes, many of which were enacted piecemeal, should be subjected to intensive scrutiny as a package by the Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs. I would hope that would be one of the first assignments that committee would be disposed to take up.

I agree also that the terms of the Canadian Constitution, including the British North America Act, should be similarly examined. It is true that federal-provincial discussions are now under way with regard to the Constitution; that we in the Government have been giving these matters some consideration over the last few months; that the provinces are likewise engaged in the consideration of these vital matters, as we know; and that the federal and provincial governments will be meeting shortly to discuss matters of constitutional import, as well as other problems which engage the attention of the two senior levels of government.

However, as an individual senator, I certainly cannot and do not take the position that the Senate is in any way inhibited from conducting its own independent survey in this field. The present discussions to which I have alluded are as among governments, but, whatever proposals may ultimately emanate from