

Hon. Bill Jarvis (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate on the amendment not necessarily as a Member from a rural riding in Ontario, not necessarily from my specific riding, but as a Member of Parliament from Ontario to speak from a provincial point of view.

I think it is very important that all Members speak from that regional point of view. I compliment many of my colleagues from the Maritimes, British Columbia and all parts of Canada for having done so. In passing, I might say that I am disappointed and a little surprised that I have not been the beneficiary of the viewpoints of NDP Members from British Columbia. I believe there have only been one or two British Columbia NDP Members who have participated so far. I am very anxious to hear that viewpoint.

Mr. Orlikow: They will be here this afternoon.

Mr. Althouse: That is a third of them. A third of yours have not spoken.

Mr. Jarvis: I said that very kindly; I did not say it disparagingly. I want to hear that British Columbia viewpoint as far as the NDP caucus is concerned. I believe I have a right to hear it. If that will upset people, I will not dwell on it any longer.

I wish to deal specifically with the amendment that would permit me, as an Ontario Member, a reasonable length of time to discharge what I believe is my responsibility to explain this legislation. I am not concerned about dotting each "i" and crossing each "t" but I want to have the time to explain to my constituents the regional interest that is a very major part of this Bill.

I believe many of us in Ontario have long forgotten that the birth of the Crow rate resulted from the trade between industrialized central Canada and the great grain-producing areas of western Canada. Therefore I would like to have some time to remind my constituents of that fact. The purpose for seeking more time is not necessarily to gain their support for my position or that of my Party but to discharge my responsibility to explain regional views.

I hope that I strike a responsive chord in the Minister when I say that I am proud to join with two other colleagues in spending three sessions a day on the Special Joint Committee on Senate Reform. Our objective is not simply to reform the Senate but to reform it in a way that will enable the Senate to represent regional views. I feel very deeply about that goal without having any preconceived notions for the mechanism of accomplishing it.

It is surprising that two matters are frequently raised at those hearings as examples of what is needed in our process. This particular Bill has been raised by senators, academics, lawyers and other witnesses who have come before us. Another subject which is continually raised is the Pepin-Robarts Report, which is a coincidence since the Minister happens to be the Minister responsible for this legislation.

Flowing from that report and others, we have been told over and over again that we have to find mechanisms by which

people in the regions would at least feel that their views were expressed as part of the process. The last Senator Lamontagne, as the Minister well knows, made great contributions in this area. People do not necessarily want their views to represent the final decision because I think they will sometimes accept decisions as long as they believe they had a voice in making that decision.

I do not wish to be patronizing but the Minister responsible for this legislation and one of my closest and dearest friends and political mentor, John Robarts, have contributed a great deal to the initiation of the process in which I am now playing a very small part.

I would like to have six months to deal with the Crow. I cannot go to my constituents this weekend because they are very busy. I will participate in the main motion. I intend to send out approximately 25,000 copies of my speech in which I wish to explain the regional interest, its depth and the socio-economic and cultural aspect of the Crow rate. While all 25,000 copies may not be read, I hope that I will at least have discharged my responsibility as an Ontario Member to point out that this Bill concerns a regional interest. We cannot always do this on the floor of the House of Commons. We can express our views aggressively and helpfully in caucus and when the caucus decision is made one must go along with the Party. I am proud that I have always voted with my Party but I would like to be able to send a speech to my constituents which states that this is a regional interest in western Canada which we, as fellow Canadians, must understand.

May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[English]

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

MR. ALLMAND—EXPLANATION FOR VOTE ON ANTI-WEAPONS TESTING MOTION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East): Madam Speaker, on Tuesday I voted for the Cruise missile resolution, but did not get recognized during the debate to explain my position and vote. I would like to do that briefly now. On Tuesday, in voting for the resolution, I voted against the escalation of the nuclear arms race by any nation, and in particular against the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada. I did so because both sides now have enough nuclear power to