

Dominion-Provincial Conference

be, within provincial jurisdiction, or concurrently within federal-provincial jurisdiction—then, we must find ways of having the provinces directly represented at conferences where these subjects are discussed. They must participate in the decisions and go back home to implement the conclusions of such conferences within the spheres of their jurisdictions.

Therefore, I say there are two parts to the solution of the problem of international affairs, whatever the precise details may be. One is to define the establishment of Canada as one nation in a community of nations, and the other is to find a useful part for the provinces to play in international exchanges which concern matters within their jurisdictions—

Mr. Peters: And within the Canadian framework.

Mr. Lewis: And within the Canadian framework.

I want to say that as far as reform of the Senate is concerned, we are still of the opinion that there should only be an elected parliament in this country and that no part of it should be appointed. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government white paper urge that members of the Senate should be appointed by the provinces as well as by the federal government, and thus make the Senate more representative of the provinces, I am left rather unimpressed. What this proposal will mean is that Senators, instead of being appointed by one government and, therefore, if they feel any responsibility at all to a government will feel that responsibility to one, they will be appointed by 11 governments. There will be little cliques of senators, each clique representing a particular government and a particular point of view. There is no sense in that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And none of them responsible to the people.

Mr. Lewis: There will be none of them responsible to the people, and we see no sense in that. We still feel that the Senate ought not to be part of our parliamentary system. If there is going to be one, and I am not qualifying my personal position that there is no need for the Senate in Canada, then we ought to find some way of electing its members so they will be responsible to the people rather than merely to the governments that appointed them.

Mr. Trudeau: May I ask the hon. member a question? Does he realize that this proposition of the federal government, which he says has no sense, was supported by all ten provincial governments?

Mr. Lewis: I realize that, Mr. Speaker, and I would have been surprised had they not supported it because the proposal gives them a chance to make a few more appointments, and every government likes that. It may well be that, as a result of an agreement between the federal government and the governments of the ten provinces, some such amendment to the constitution should be made. I do not think such an amendment would destroy our country, but let me say this: If that is done it will be, in my opinion, and I am using strong language knowing the meaning of the word, a betrayal of democracy. If the Senate is given even more powers than it now has, as is also suggested in the white paper, this is what will happen.

I do not think I need to say very much more. Many members of my party have made similar statements and I made my position quite clear at the time the resolution which preceded the official languages bill was introduced. I said that we favour this piece of legislation. However, there are two points I should like to make which have arisen since the introduction of that resolution and the bill. The first and most important is that there is a great need for explanation and clarification across Canada as to the meaning, the import and the implications of the introduction of the official languages act within the federal sphere. There is need not only for explanation and clarification but also for assurance that no one now in the federal service who has given many years of service to Canada will suffer as a result of the introduction of this act.

Again, the situation has not been helped by the hasty action which has been taken in certain spheres in Ottawa. As the result of the introduction of bilingualism into the civil service, some people were victimized. I think the introduction of bilingualism in Canada must be made without arousing new prejudices, without increasing the differences that exist, and without calling forth further resentment. It is extremely important, and I am sure members of the government will agree, that this ought to be done without loss of time. We must clarify what the act is intended to do, its implications, and cease any more actions by any agency of government which makes