

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. I regret that under Standing Order 35(1) the first three speakers have unlimited time—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Maybe I can clarify. If there has been an arrangement, although I was not aware—

Mr. Prud'homme: Bring Crosbie back.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): May I just have the floor for a minute? The first three speakers have unlimited time and I believe those who have unlimited time do not have a question or comment period, in accordance with Standing Order 35(1). After that, there are 20 minute speeches plus the question and comment period.

● (1520)

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be willing to waive the rule because I find that the Minister's questions are very instructive and revealing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): We have standing orders. Perhaps we could do something like that after the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) proposes new rules and regulations.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, of course, we have rules and we must follow rules. However, your Honour also knows that we can do anything we want with unanimous consent. If you succeed in bringing back the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie), I would like to seek unanimous consent under the condition that you ask the Minister of Justice to come back to the House. We would like to ask him questions as well.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I appreciate the Hon. Member's comments, but under these particular rules, I regret that we will not be able to do so. Therefore, I would like to recognize the next Hon. Member for debate.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Friesen: It will be a short speech—abolish the Senate.

Mr. Murphy: It will be a short speech because, unlike the first two speakers, I do not have unlimited time.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): We will give it to you.

Mr. Murphy: However, I am in a position to be asked questions which will help educate Hon. Members, in any event. As a former teacher, I always believed that it was good for the class to learn by asking questions of the teacher.

In many ways I regret that we are dealing with this resolution at this time. It is interesting to note that the first resolution introduced by the Government after its Budget is one concerning the Senate. We were led to believe by the Government that it had an economic package which would create jobs for young Canadians. We were led to believe that it had an economic vision for the nation. Therefore, I suggest it would be logical that two weeks after its Budget, the Govern-

The Constitution

ment would come forward with its legislative package in order for the Opposition and Canadians as a whole to know exactly what the Government wishes to do. Instead, we are dealing with what I believe is quite accurately called a diversionary tactic. We are dealing with a resolution restricting the legislative role of the second House. This was a policy that the Conservatives never espoused during the election campaign.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order. I simply want to remind the Hon. Member that he does have 20 minutes, followed by a question and answer period. It is only the first two speakers who have unlimited time. He can govern himself accordingly.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I said that as an aside earlier, but I did not want to challenge your ruling at that time.

Since I do have a brief period in which to speak, let me point out that by taking away the legislative role of the second Chamber, it is challenging the very reason for having a second Chamber. By limiting it to a 30 day review of monetary bills and a 45 day review of non-monetary bills, the Government is really saying that we do not need a second chamber in this land. Of course, that is something that I can accept.

Incidentally, I was disturbed by a report in the news media last night and today that the Liberal House Leader has suggested using the second Chamber to prevent any legislation which would deindex the old age pension. I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) supports that, but it was certainly reported as a statement made by the House Leader of his Party.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): That is not what he said, apparently.

Mr. Murphy: That was the interpretation. If that was the idea of the Liberal Party or any party that had control of the Senate, it would be a stupid and very dangerous move. While I believe we should do what we can within this Chamber and in the nation as a whole to protect the indexation of the old age pension, I do not believe we could ever use an undemocratically appointed, non responsible Chamber for that purpose. It would mix a good cause with the murky reputation of the Senate and Canadians would become confused about whether we were fighting for the rights of the Senate or for the ordinary pensioners of this land. The real cause is the fight for the pensioners and the Senate should not be used in that cause.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: But you will do it here.

Mr. Murphy: We will do it here, Mr. Minister. I believe it would be dangerous to use the Senate for any such purpose. Although many Canadians would support the use of the Senate in defence of pensioners, it would be very easy for a Senate majority or any group of Senators to take up their own noble cause in the future which may not be acceptable to a majority of others.

Our main disagreement with this resolution is that the Government is trying to reform the Senate while maintaining