

Retirement Age for Senators

ten minutes to introduce this bill. In view of the many years of discussion about Senate reform, which has resulted in this so-called bill for Senate reform, I am surprised it took even ten minutes.

There has been a good deal of criticism both in this House and in the other place about some of the things which have been said about this bill. Some of the members of the other place woke up from their slumber long enough to attack the hon. Member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) because of a speech he made in relation to this bill. The Member for Port Arthur quoted extensively from an article written by Mr. Peter Newman, who is well known in this country for his undeviating support of the Liberal Party. Mr. Newman hates the former Prime Minister and has no use for the group to which I belong, so he has no alternative but to support the Party now in power.

In the article from which the hon. Member for Port Arthur quoted, Mr. Newman referred to the appointments made by prime ministers, name by name, pointing out their qualifications, and concluded that the main qualification, if not the only one, of a Senator was that he had distinguished himself as a collector of funds for the Liberal Party. Was Mr. Newman wrong in this suggestion? Was the hon. Member for Port Arthur wrong when he read these suggestions into the record? If these gentlemen are wrong, why have we not heard a repudiation? We have not heard one, so we must assume that the suggestions are accurate.

Is there anything wrong with being a collector of finances for a political party? I have collected money for my party and I am not ashamed of it, although I do not like the job. There is nothing wrong with being a collector for the Liberal Party or any other party.

Mr. Peters: We did not promise you a Senate seat.

Mr. Orlikow: No, I was not promised a Senate seat and I would not have accepted one, in any event. We will come to that subject a little later.

Let me say in reply to those who criticize the statements made by the hon. Member for Port Arthur that I should like them to inform me what other qualifications the individuals to which reference was made have which make them deserving of a Senate appointment. I think it is incumbent upon hon. Members on the other side of this House to put

[Mr. Orlikow.]

the record straight. If the hon. Member for Port Arthur misrepresented the facts, let them say so.

Today for the first time we have heard a number of Members from the opposite side of this chamber speak on this proposed change to the Senate. I could not help but wonder how many of those preachers were preaching for a call, hoping that in the future they might be called to another place.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Orlikow: Let me remind the hon. Member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart) that just before we adjourned for lunch an hon. Member suggested that we in this party were anti-British. He demonstrated by that remark his complete ignorance of the British Upper Chamber. That is one body with which the Canadian Senate cannot be compared. The Canadian Senate has virtually unlimited power and can hold up legislation indefinitely. The British House of Lords can only hold up legislation from one session to another. The Canadian Senate is limited as to numbers whereas the British Prime Minister could recommend to the Queen tomorrow, if the House of Lords attempted to block his bill in respect of the steel industry, that 600 new members be appointed to that chamber in order that he would have support. Those Members who suggest that, because we are opposed to the great powers held by the Canadian Senate we are anti-British, display only an ignorance of the facts. We do not deny the fact that we are abolitionists, because we believe there is no need for a Senate in Canada, and that the Senate should—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member but I feel that his remarks now go beyond the provisions of the bill before us. I am sure the hon. Member will recall that this House decided this morning that an amendment posed by an hon. Member in regard to the abolition of the Senate was out of order. I suggest to the hon. Member that his remarks now in regard to the abolition of the Senate are also out of order, and I would request that he confine his remarks to the provisions of the bill before us, which relate to the retirement of the members of the Senate.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I should like to co-operate with you, but I note that the Chair did not restrict the hon. Members for Carleton (Mr. Francis) and Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart) when they discussed