

Senators' integrity, honesty, or character are not in order. To reduce the possibility of personal references, convention further requires Members to refer to each other by title, position or constituency name. Likewise, the Senate is usually "the other place," and Senators, "members of the other place".

• (1740)

I simply wanted to make this clarification for the benefit of the House during the rest of the debate, until 10 p.m. this evening. Resuming debate.

[English]

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to question the previous speaker and the one prior to him on a couple of things.

First of all, I want it perfectly clear that I stand firm in the belief of a truly triple-E Senate, and I also believe that what we presently have is ineffective and truly a waste of dollars for a lot of reasons.

One area that I am familiar with is the United States, as that is where I came from, and although the systems are slightly different the Senate has a significant purpose in that country and that is to protect the districts and regions from exploitation from larger regions. That is primarily its purpose.

For example, the state of Montana, with one representative by population, is protected by two senators, as all states. Montana could have been exploited on a great number of occasions had it not been for that set-up.

First of all, if we had no means of protection from exploitation by larger regions for smaller regions, what process would we use to make certain that does not happen? I am going to assume that he is going to answer in the same way as the previous speaker, that the people would take the appropriate action and put a stop to it. If he believes that, would he believe that the people of Canada as a whole should be able to take appropriate action if Quebec decides to separate?

[Translation]

**Mr. Sauvageau:** I would like to thank the hon. member for his question, as is the tradition here in this House. First of all, I want to say that, before their independence, the Americans promoted a philosophy which resulted in the fact that their Senate, although quite effective, is not representative. It is representation by population. We often heard about Loyalists demanding rep by pop and the United States having rep by pop. Of course, it is all right to have two senators per state, but then you do not have rep by pop. However, this is not the place to review the U.S. Senate, so I will try to give a more direct answer to the hon. member.

### Supply

About the triple E Senate, we believe that an elected House can undoubtedly make responsible decisions, because we support ministerial responsibility. An elected House could and should be able to make decisions concerning some legislation. Two elected Houses, if the Senate were to be a triple E Senate, could create confusion about which House must make the decision. The ten Canadian provinces, which do not have two, but only one House, show us how one House can make decisions, and very sensible decisions at that.

For example, the province of Quebec, with a population of about 7 million, got rid of the legislative council in 1968, that is nearly 30 years ago. No one in Quebec has any regrets about that decision. Other provinces also got rid of their legislative councils and I do not think they have any regrets about it. So, in Canada, an elected House where hon. members would abide by the principle of ministerial responsibility could give proper consideration to the decisions they are about to make.

• (1745)

And if Quebec were to become sovereign, I hope Canada will respect the democratic principles it has been advocating since 1867.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, and also neighbour, the hon. member for Richmond—Wolfe, clearly explained why he is against spending \$26,952,000 for the Senate. I totally agree with him, given that such a measure would, in the long run, abolish a costly but far from essential institution, namely the Senate.

It is a well-known fact, and has been for quite some time, that Quebecers do not see why they should pay to maintain the Upper House. The country is going bankrupt. Social programs are being slashed. In senior citizen centres, soup portions are being reduced from four ounces to two ounces, but we can still afford to appoint senators.

In my riding of Frontenac, every Friday, I receive a call from Mrs. Lessard, from East Broughton in my riding of Frontenac—and she must be listening now, because I informed her—, and she asks me the same question: "Hon. member, when will the government increase old age pensions? I have not quite paid my heating bill yet". She said that only last week. She also asks the following question: "When will the government abolish the GST? They promised to do so. I have some purchases to make, but I am waiting for them to abolish the GST".

How can I explain to Mrs. Lessard the government's delay in abolishing the GST, which they would rather hide than abolish? How can I explain to Mrs. Lessard that she will only get a \$1.28 monthly increase in her old age pension, while, in the other place, some are handsomely paid, appointed, not elected, to serve until they reach 75 years of age? If we had jobs like that in