

*Senate Reform*

Democratic Party which, strangely enough, is precisely that of the Labour Party of Britain. That Party believes the House of Lords should be done away with, just as the New Democratic Party thinks that our Senate should be done away with.

The real issue before us with regard to Senate reform is not so much the question of whether or not there should be a second Chamber. I think reasonable people can see very strong grounds for the continuance of a second Chamber, a Chamber of sober second thought, of serious deliberation on particular issues; a Chamber whose membership does have a longer or more permanent tenure than the membership of the House of Commons, which gives rise to the development of the necessary expertise for sober second thought. For example, the United States Senate has terms of six years, whereas the United States House of Representatives has terms of two years.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Tell us something we do not know.

**Mr. Evans:** The Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) knows so very little that just about anything I could say would be a great improvement.

The point of the Senate is to provide that sober second thought which perhaps is not possible with an elected House of Commons.

The question raised by the Hon. Member for St. John's East was whether the Senate should be elected. I think that is a very serious issue, and I happen to disagree with it. The Senate should not be elected because we do not have a system which has a separation of the executive and the legislative such as the

one in the United States that gives rise to the possibility of and rationale for having an elected Senate.

If we had an elected Senate and an elected House of Commons where the Government sat in the House of Commons, where the legislative and the executive were melded together, we would have serious conflict of interest problems between the two bodies. At what point would the power of the Senate cease to over-ride the power of the House of Commons, in which the Government would presumably sit, or would the Prime Minister and the Government sit in the Senate from time to time?

These kinds of questions where you do not have the separation of the executive and the legislative mean that it is very difficult to have an elected second Chamber. We have to have a second Chamber, but it cannot be elected in a popular fashion so that its jurisdiction and authority over-rides that of the legitimately elected Members of the House of Commons.

I see my time is up. If the House would allow me, I would certainly continue, but I understand the time allotted for the debate has expired.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) is quite correct. Pursuant to Standing Order 24(2) it is my duty to interrupt proceedings and to call it four o'clock.

It being four o'clock, pursuant to order made Thursday, April 14, 1983, this House stands adjourned until Monday next at eleven o'clock a.m., pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 2(1).

At 3.27 p.m., the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.