

*Retirement Age for Senators*

a useful function, the Government ought to look seriously at proposals made by many competent historians and political scientists to the effect that Senators ought to be elected from the provinces.

**Mr. Regan:** Where do they come from now?

**Mr. Orlikow:** What difference does it make if a broken down Liberal politician from B.C. is appointed to the Senate? Does the hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) really—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten):** Order. It is the opinion to the Chair that the House is getting well away from the principle of the bill before it, and I would wish to remind the House we are discussing the principle of a bill to make provision for the retirement of members of the Senate. I would hope that the House would remain within the confines of the bill before it. Again, I should point out that the principle of the bill has nothing to do with appointments to the Senate. It is a bill for the retirement of members of the Senate.

**Mr. Peters:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that we are on second reading of the bill, which is acceptance in principle, and therefore there can be no legitimate objection to alternatives being provided for the principle that you insinuate is in the bill? If there is any principle in it, then it appears to me any alternative to that principle should also be a debatable subject. Therefore I suggest that the alternatives to the principle in the bill may form part of second reading. In my opinion anything less would be completely negative of the whole process that in debating the principle of a bill there is the opportunity to suggest an alternative. If this were not true, then there would be no need for this discussion, and on second reading one could only vote against the principle of the bill. I suggest that democratically we have a right to suggest an alternative to the principle proposed by the Government.

**Mr. Orlikow:** On the point raised—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten):** Order. I recognize the argument which the hon. Member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) presented, but I should again point out to him that this morning the House voted that a discussion of abolition of the Senate was not relative to the point before the House. If the question of abolition is not relative to the point before the House, then I should have to argue equally strongly that the question of

retention is not relevant. The bill before the House provides for the retirement of Senators, and I believe that the purpose of the bill and the principle of it are rather confined to narrow limits. I would hope those who continue to make remarks on the principle of the bill will recognize these limits.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, on the point you raise, may I point out with the utmost respect that the hon. Member for Antigonish-Guysborough quoted in some detail a suggestion made earlier by the hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre in which he argued for abolition, and the hon. Member called that a form of primitive democracy, or something to that effect. The hon. Member for Carleton (Mr. Francis) discussed the position of his party on abolition, and I am asking for the opportunity to do no more than that. I shall be through in a minute.

I am not discussing the virtues of abolition, but surely we have before us a bill providing for Senate reform. And surely if a Member like myself thinks that the proposal for Senate reform does not go far enough, I have a right to explain in detail what I think should be done in the way of Senate reform, and to explain why I intend to vote against the bill. If I do not have that right, and if other Members do not have that right, then we have no right to put our points of view forward.

It seems to me that if those who believe in Senate reform, or those who talk so fervently about it, meant business, they would discuss this question of representation by the provinces, not representation by ex-politicians, by fund raisers and bagmen who do not represent the thinking of the provinces. I shall continue to oppose as vigorously as I can the principles espoused by those people who belong to one or other of the Social Credit parties. But Social Credit have been in power in Alberta for 30 years, and have been in power in B.C. consecutively longer than any other group. Surely if the Senate were to represent the views of the provinces one might expect there would be one single appointment of a Social Credit member. But the plums are too far and too few, and they have to be reserved for the Liberal Party when it is in power, and for the Conservative Party when it is in power.

There was a C.C.F. government in power for 20 years in Saskatchewan, but not a single representative of that party was appointed to the Senate and, to my knowl-