

stamping in the Senate is that there are usually more senators present to rubber-stamp the legislation than there are members in the other place.

**Senator Flynn:** We take our responsibilities more seriously.

**Senator Phillips:** Yes. We even get Senator Lawson to come in for some votes.

**An Hon. Senator:** Occasionally.

**Hon. John M. Godfrey:** When?

**Senator Phillips:** But when a member does break ranks with his party—

**An Hon. Senator:** Never!

**Senator Phillips:**—the media reports indicate that so-and-so voted “against his party.” That shows, honourable senators, just how little those in the media really think about their reporting. It should not be reported that a member voted against his party, but that a member voted against the legislation. Certainly we should all be able to do that regardless of what party is in power. If we could do a few of those things, Parliament would be far more functional than it is now.

Senator Roblin in his remarks said that the public concept of the Senate was so low he didn't think it could survive. Well, I speak to a good many people throughout the year and I often speak to them in situations where—

**Senator Macquarrie:**—they can't answer.

**Senator Phillips:**—they cannot answer, but they have to be frank when they do answer. I do not find that the Senate has any worse reputation than the House of Commons or the legislatures.

**Senator Flynn:** It has none at all.

**Senator Phillips:** Unfortunately, all three have a very poor reputation in the eyes of the public.

Recently I saw the sponsor of the resolution being interviewed on TV following an interparliamentary meeting in this chamber. He was complaining vigorously that the Senate had no political legitimacy.

Honourable senators, even a mild tempered individual like me has been known to refer to the personal legitimacy of certain senators, but when it comes to the chamber I think there is a political legitimacy for it—and that is the Constitution, Senator Roblin. The Constitution makes this chamber legitimate; whether it is elected or appointed, it is a legitimate branch of Parliament.

I find the most confusing part of Senator Roblin's remarks occurred when he equated a vote with the solution, saying that if there was just a chance for people in various regions to vote again everything would be all right. Well, I cannot agree with that, Senator Roblin. I think you placed an awful lot of distance between your resolution and the truth of the matter.

**Senator Roblin:** I hope I never did that.

**Senator Phillips:** I would say you achieved a sort of “political infinity” in that regard. It occurred to me to wonder

[Senator Phillips.]

whether the resolution had not been prompted by a certain feeling in western Canada that an elected Senate would give the west a voice in the central government. The Western Canada Concept advertisements used to say, “Once elected Senate.” Always when I looked at those ads I wondered how many senators they thought we had. We have only one. The ads could have said, “An elected Senate.”

In any event, I would like honourable senators to consider the regional representation in the other house. Let us look at representation in the other house in terms of the Senate regions. Consider the western region. In the other house they have 89 seats or 29 per cent of the vote. In the Senate the same region has 24 seats or 23 per cent of the vote. If the election of members is the criterion for success, honourable senators, surely we can anticipate that the 29 per cent voting to represent the western region in the House of Commons would be far more efficient than the 23 per cent appointed in this chamber. Just what does the honourable senator who sponsored the resolution expect the 23 per cent to do that the elected 29 per cent cannot do?

Let's have a look at some of the individual provinces. British Columbia, with 33 members, has 11 per cent of the membership in the other house. It has six members in this chamber, or 6 per cent of the vote. I do not know which situation Premier Bennett would prefer—the 33 members representing him or the six senators representing him. I suspect that, if we asked him, he would probably say he did not want either number but I think he would be better off with the 11 per cent than with the 6 per cent.

Quebec, with 79 members, has 25 per cent of the vote in the other place. If you go to western Canada, the complaint you most frequently receive is that Quebec, with 25 per cent of the vote in the other house and 23 per cent of the vote in this house, receives everything. But, honourable senators, the same western region has 29 per cent of the votes. The fact that there is such a difference must be due to one of two reasons. It is either due to the system, or due to the calibre of the members. I presume it must be the system, because I believe there is a majority of Conservative members in western Canada. At least, I hope it is the system.

● (1500)

In case anybody wants to have a look at the Atlantic region, and would like to quote the figures back to me, the Atlantic region has 11 per cent of the membership in the House of Commons, and 28 per cent of the membership in this chamber. I can explain that away by saying most of the Senate members from the Atlantic region are Grits and, therefore, really do not count.

**Senator Frith:** There is something wrong with that system.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Leader of the Government):** There is something wrong with that conclusion, in any event.

**Senator Phillips:** Following the by-election in Olds-Didsbury in the province of Alberta, two of the Alberta members, the honourable member for Crowfoot and the honourable