

We say we review legislation here. But do we? How much review, how much examination do we give orders in council—and orders in council are the real administration, the real government of this country? Thousands of these orders in council are passed all the time. Do we look them over to see that they are in the interests of Canada? We do not. Do we look to see what delegation of power they contain—and we all know that powers are delegated to bureaus, commissions, and so on, and so on? This is really what we should be doing.

It is true that the Senate is here to protect, as far as possible, the rights of the provinces, but it is here mainly to protect the rights of the individual. That is our task, above all—that, and to see to it that powers being delegated to the bureaucrats by orders in council are not abused. We know that such cases have occurred. We have found out about them, especially in the Immigration Department, where delegated authority was abused, where those people took on powers they were never given at all. These are the things we should be looking into.

I am, of course, in favour of standing committees. But I do not believe that this body should be changed from what it was intended to be, namely, a review body, into an investigative house sending people all over Canada trying to discover things and reporting things. I think it was Mr. Disraeli who once said that royal commissions discovered what everybody already knew.

● (2030)

The other day the Leader of the Government told us of the great good that had accrued from investigations the Senate had carried out. I ask Senator Croll now whether all, or even most, of the recommendations of the Special Senate Committee on Poverty were accepted? There have been a few cases, of course, when we did influence legislation, but if anyone tells me that in the twelve years I have been in this house investigations carried out by this house, or by any special committee of this house, have really influenced in a meaningful way the legislation of the government, I will tell him that he has not read the story aright.

I would like to see this house with standing committees that would ensure that our bureaucrats—who, as we all know, are the real governors of this country—are brought before the Senate and made to explain why and how they get their ministers to present certain legislation. I know this is a fact in Ottawa. I have been here 60 years and I know something of how the civil service works. I know that when there is a change of government in this country and a new minister goes into his portfolio, certain gentlemen in the department, who may not like him or agree with him, keep back from him facts that he should have, and determine the character of the legislation in consequence. This is the sort of thing we should be examining, not running all over Canada trying to find out this, that and the other thing. To begin with, we are not equipped to do it, and we have no guarantee at all that our findings will be accepted.

I happen myself to have been chairman of a royal commission. Were my recommendations accepted? They are talking about accepting them now. My recommendations were not then accepted for the simple reason that Mr. Luce had great power with the Congress and the State

[Senator O'Leary.]

Department, and there is scarcely any doubt that word came to us in Canada if we touched *Time* and *Reader's Digest* something unpleasant would happen to us in Washington. My honourable friend Senator Hayden knows something about this. I think he even introduced and defended it, and he always defends even a bad cause well. The fact of the matter is that *Time* and *Reader's Digest* made Mr. Luce an honorary citizen of Canada so that his papers would get the same treatment that Canadian papers received. Those two publications are not Canadian papers. Everybody knows this. They are getting those special privileges simply because they had power at Washington, and Washington had influence with us.

These are the sorts of things the Senate should be looking into. Why bother about carrying on these lengthy, interminable and costly experiments, with visits here, there and everywhere, giving people trips? I do not believe in that sort of thing. Let us have our standing committees. Let the standing committees carry out the work this Senate was created to carry out, the work of seeing to it that legislation does not injure the individual—or a province, for that matter. But let us not get this silly notion that we can send ten or fifteen people to British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta, Quebec, or what have you, and tell them what we are going to do for the provinces. We have no power to do anything for the provinces. There are bound to be negotiations between the governments concerned, and to say that this Senate is to exercise its true function by going into the country and telling the provinces what we may do for them, and what we should do for them, is utter nonsense.

Honourable senators, I do not wish to go on for very long on the Speech from the Throne. However, I take this question seriously. I think this Senate is a great body. There is no question about it in my mind. I want to add quite frankly that not all the appointments made here by Mr. Trudeau have been bad appointments. He has made some excellent appointments. I am looking at three or four of them now who are very good. He did make some that are very bad. However, he is changing this house into a one-party chamber. If he goes on with his supposed or alleged intention of replacing a Tory burial with a Tory appointment, then for as long as he remains in power we will have only seventeen members in a chamber of 102. What sort of a democracy is that?

Rightly or wrongly, this house was set up as a two-party chamber. This may have been a mistake, but this was the structure. All along there were men who saw the weakness of that and tried to get rid of it. I have heard some unsophisticated journalists express surprise that Mr. Trudeau appointed a good senator like Senator Lawson, for example; they remarked what a change this was. My friends, Sir John A. Macdonald appointed Liberals to the Senate. He appointed people to the Senate who disagreed with him violently, such as Peter Mitchell. Sir Robert Borden appointed M. J. O'Brien, a powerful Liberal industrialist, to the Senate. Mr. R. B. Bennett, when he was Prime Minister, appointed Patrick Burns of Calgary to this house. Mr. St. Laurent appointed John Hackett, one of the most distinguished Liberals in the country.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh!