

Then 1911 rolled along and the great Conservatives came in under Sir Robert Borden. Following that there was a period of a little uncertainty in the elections of 1920 and 1925. In 1926 Mr. King got in and inherited a Senate that was not too pleasing to him. Governments do not like Senates to delay their legislation. MacKenzie King was exasperated and, according to Professor Blair Neatby, was always annoyed by the tendency of senators to effect judicial impartiality when it meant voting against government legislation. I suppose that in less classic language things like that are being said not far from this chamber to this day.

But the biggest time for Senate reform came in my own lifetime. During the Trudeau years I find there were 15 programs or suggestions for Senate reform. I am sure that senators know them very well. They came from joint committees, from Senate committees, from House of Commons committees, from wise men in the various legislatures—the Conservative Party had one, the Liberals of Quebec had one—the boards of trade, Canada west, and so forth. When the latest group of saviours and savants has set up a commission, I will be very interested when their report comes out to see how many things they can suggest which have not already been suggested by one of these 15 or 16 other organizations.

● (1720)

There will be a great strain on the incredulity if there is anything that has not been said before. We must be careful not to say never. They say that never is a long time.

Senator Frith touched upon the essence of our problem, if problem is not too strong a word. Professor Peyton Lyon has written the most concise article on the inner tensions of the concept of Triple-E. An elected Senate can be taken more easily than the other two Es. When the President of the United States was addressing the joint houses, our Speaker noted that when the American upper house became elected that resulted in a diminution of the relative strength of the House of Representatives. He cleverly indicated that some of the House of Commons colleagues in Canada might bear that in mind. There may be a sense in the House of Commons that a powerful elected Senate would draw its power from their base. Men and women in politics are not usually given to surrendering their realm of parity, importance and significance. However, that is in the future.

The things which make the House of Commons different from us are relative to power—the power of the purse, and the power which goes to the whole issue of confidence. If a Senate was elected, drawing its support from popular election, would it stand idly by and be denied the right of the purse? If it attained the right of being involved in the budget, is not the next step, the question of confidence, a much shorter step than it is now?

Senator Roblin is getting very fond of the two kings in Israel simile. This no doubt will face us some day. I do not know what to think of the effective part of the Triple-E. I suppose this Senate, unreformed as it still is in many ways, could make itself more effective. If they mean as powerful as the House of Commons, then clearly we will get into trouble with the House

of Commons. If they mean more power, detracting some from the executive, they will get into worse trouble. I hope I will be around long enough to see how the Triple-E gets along in this latest careful scrutiny, which will be visited upon us in due course and which may come along inside of five years.

The hardest one to envisage being enacted is the one that Prince Edward Island lost out on in 1865, and that is the equal aspect. That is a very appealing idea, but it will be difficult to impose after a century and a quarter. If we had been brought up on it, we could have adapted. The Americans, with a quite different system, do not have the problem of confidence. The Australians did although, according to some critics, they are suffering from the fact that their upper house is too strong at the present time. I do not know if Senator Frith, on that road to Damascus, will agree, but that is part of the problem.

**Senator Frith:** I agree. They can deny supply and in some circumstances not have to have an election themselves, but can force the House of Representatives that way.

**Senator Macquarrie:** Exactly.

**Senator Frith:** That is not right.

**Senator Macquarrie:** That is why there has never been a formula worked out. People who were on these commissions—and the Speaker *pro tempore* presiding over this chamber was a chairman on one of the committees—were not stupid people. If there had been a simple, easy solution, they might have found it. I do not see having a Senate with 6, 10, 12 or 15 senators from each province. I do not think the Province of Quebec will want to move from a status of a distinct society to a diminished society. I can understand how they would feel. It would be unreasonable to suggest that they would do otherwise.

Indeed, one of these important studies a few years ago envisaged a situation whereby the Province of Quebec would enhance its role within the upper house. To suggest that we could move to the other *diminuendo* is, I fear, a bit of wishful thinking. We all do a bit of that, but we cannot rely on it totally and forever.

I would like to see the Senate do more to reform itself. I do not want to bring in anything controversial, because I am not that type. I believe that one of the smartest things the Senate ever did was to establish the system of prestudy. That was a sane way of making itself more effective.

The two houses and the system as a whole could have, through the years, found some way to ease the load. It is a ridiculous thing that through the years a great load of legislation comes down in the last few days. You would think that somewhere in the past century and a quarter the Senate might have said, "We plan this kind of a year. We will deal with any legislation you send us."

Arthur Meighen denounced the practice that at the eleventh hour we are sent a flood of legislation and we are supposed to pass it unamended, unquestioned, and without delay. With all the great men and women who have sat in the Senate chamber, one might wonder why it has not been more assertive. Harold Laski once wrote a very sharp remark about the