

Senate. He said that it does not even command its own self respect. I wonder if sometimes we are too ready to take second place and status lower than we deserve. I believe that that implication is not a bad one.

Many senators are hesitant to assert themselves. Some are almost apologetic for not being elected. What is our legality? What is our legitimacy?

● (1730)

But as the whip has said: Legitimacy comes from the Constitution. He does come out with great ideas. He said some years ago—but I have not heard him say it lately—that what we want around here is more independence and fewer of these party votes.

Senator Petten: That was about seven years ago!

Senator Macquarrie: I thought he was right then and I still think that he is right, but I wonder if he still thinks that he was right. He has not mentioned it lately.

Senator Phillips: The situation has changed somewhat.

Senator Macquarrie: I thought that someone had changed. The fact is, something has changed—that is for sure.

Senator Frith was longing for a little less partisanship. In part of his speech I believe he referred to that. I have always thought that there is partisanship in the Senate, of course, but, to use one of today's agriculturalist expressions, it is really subcutaneous. With some, you do not have to scratch too much, one tiny little drop of a pin will do it. Some of the rest of us are steeped in objectivity and would need quite a scarification to bring it out in some of us.

This brings me to another feature. Some people say, "Yes, we should have an elected Senate. There is too much partisanship there." How in the name of heaven could you diminish partisanship by putting the senatorial people through an election? In an election who would put them there? It would be a political party. You would then imprint the label of the party more firmly than ever.

We will have a new senator coming in here soon. We have all been waiting for him—especially the people from Alberta. He will be a member of the Reform Party. The appointed man he replaced was an independent Liberal. That is the finest kind, and is a little closer to objectivity. However, that is another dream.

I was intrigued somewhat by the dialection that Senator Frith made on the question of property. That is a fascinating thing. For example, people of substance who have \$4,000—my God—at the advanced age of 30 could be trusted more than these sansculottes from the lower house.

I belong to a province that kept the property qualification for voting longer than any other part of the dominion. If you had \$325 worth of property, you could vote in every constituency that you held that property in. You also had the bonus of voting the other side of the ticket, which would basically be residential. But if you had the money, you did not have to worry about the residence; you just got the second vote.

[Senator Macquarrie.]

We had an interesting system in P.E.I. We made our second house elected and merged it with the lower house and made it one big assembly. But the property principles were kept in the franchise. We were reluctant to let that go. We hung on to that like we hung on to prohibition—longer than any other part of the country. We are considered to be very interested in politics and rather interested in drinking, too, but the two were connected.

It seems to me that in this day and age—this wonderful 1990—we have not quite lost that. Was it an instinct? Was it a fear? Was it a preference that gave something extra to the so-called man of substance, the man with the stake in the community, or, to use R.B. Bennett's words, the man who had gained a competence? R.B. Bennett never said that he earned money; he said that he gained competence.

I wonder if today the power of the corporate elite is not an extremely important factor in our society. I wonder if we have not all seen a decline in the relative strength of the labour unions in the last 20 years. That is not only in Britain, Canada or the United States. I can also remember that big, bright-eyed, bushy-tailed American, John L. Lewis, who frightened legislators in that country. But that is no more.

Sometimes I wonder, with a little perplexity, about the role of the international financial community. How important is what takes place in the stock markets of the world?

We had an episode in Canada that in many ways was blown out of proportion. Some commentators were saying that there were calls for the resignation of a minister. But the stock market was already showing the jittery sense of that. If what goes on in the Nikkei and the Hang Seng becomes so important in our decisions to do things to our Constitution, our leaders, or our collective selves—that is, if it becomes loaded by the power of the knights of the economic realm—then surely that is some kind of form of what we used to do when we gave a surplus in voting power to the people who had a surplus of financial power.

If I were in my university I would stop right there, and I will do almost the same thing here. There are many things that we can reflect upon. I believe that Senator MacDonald, Senator Frith and all of us may have many opportunities to reflect upon this important question.

This is a great institution. How many legislative assemblies would have this kind of debate? How many would be making the speeches that Senator Frith has made? How many assemblies would have people who took all of this as an important part of their role in public life? This is a splendid legislative assembly. I only wish that some of the people who can toss off sardonic comments or smart remarks would know a bit about what goes on in our committees and in our whole realm of inquiries; that is, the wide range of interest and great knowledge that has been brought to the legislative realm in Canada by people who were appointed. We could make a list of men and women of superior quality who were never interested in running for an election but who came into this place and served, and served nobly. It is very difficult for someone,