

Senate Role in Parliamentary System

quickly see to what I have reference. I made no exhaustive study, but if my figures are wrong at all they are not wrong to any great extent. Let me give a couple of examples of what I have in mind.

Senator Hayden is a director of 10 companies in Canada. Senator Aird is the director of eight or nine companies. Senator Molson is the director of eight companies. Senator Gelinas is director of 15 companies and Senator Thorvaldson is a director of nine companies. There is nothing illegal about this and I do not suggest that for a minute, but I do want to say that in a chamber which has the tremendous legal power which the Canadian Senate has, this could be and is a very dangerous situation.

Robert McKeown, who writes in *Weekend* magazine had a column on September 12, 1969 headed "Senators should be above suspicion—but they're not". He quoted from Section 53 of the rules of the Senate as follows:

No senator is entitled to vote upon any question in which he has any pecuniary interest whatsoever, not held in common with the rest of the Canadian subjects of the Crown; and the vote of any such senator so interested will be disallowed.

Robert McKeown goes on to detail how three bills dealing with bank charters were tied up for several weeks in the Senate Banking and Commerce Committee, the memberships of which included four directors of chartered banks and whose chairman, Senator Salter Hayden, was a director of the Bank of Nova Scotia. Senator Hayden did not consider that being a director of a bank meant he had a pecuniary interest in the matter before the Senate. Robert McKeown said, and I agree, that Senator Hayden's definition may satisfy Senator Hayden and some other senators but it should not satisfy Prime Minister Trudeau or the Canadian public. I do not believe it does.

The situation in the Senate is not new. Goldwin Smith said this about appointments to the Senate:

The Senate is a bribery fund in the hands of the Government... nor on its present footing will it ever be anything else—

Stephen Leacock, and certainly he was no flaming radical, said:

Liberals and Conservatives combined, we made our Senate not a superior council of the nation, but a refuge of place-hunting politicians and reward for partisan adherence.

I could not agree often with what Stephen Leacock said or wrote about public affairs, but I can agree with every word he said in

[Mr. Orlikow.]

that passage more than a quarter of a century ago because it is still true.

If we consider the appointments former Prime Minister Pearson made to the Senate in his five years in office, we find that he made 31 appointments to that chamber. George Bain has analyzed them and points out that five were appointed because of their devotion to duty in the backrooms of the Liberal party, five because of their uniformly distinguished service in the House of Commons, four for their tenacity in hunting down campaign contributions in the role of party bagmen, three were recognized because of valour in the face of unequal odds, their inability to get elected in the Liberal cause, and five more because of miscellaneous contributions of time and effort to the Liberal party in the provinces.

In my own province of Manitoba, I can think of one senator appointed by the former Prime Minister. His main claim to fame is that he was the campaign director for the Liberal party during two elections in Manitoba. In one they elected two members out of 14 and in the second they elected one out of 14. That may be too many, but it does not speak well for his organizational ability.

Mr. Osler: You took over his policies.

● (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Orlikow: We took over his policy—ha ha. I wouldn't mind taking over his financial status. However, this is the situation. Mr. Pearson will be remembered, and given credit, for a great number of things. He gave this country many years of distinguished service. One thing for which he will not be remembered and given credit is the calibre of the appointments he made to the Senate. Let me say, somewhat in defence of Mr. Pearson, I do not suppose his appointments were any worse than those of Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. St. Laurent, Mr. King or Mr. Bennett before him. That is the way the system works. I submit that it is a bad system. Frequently, the Canadian Senate has been compared by those who would defend it to the British House of Lords. We must keep in mind, however, that the Senate, unlike the House of Lords, has a fixed number of members.

The British prime minister, if his legislation is threatened by the House of Lords, has a certain right. When Lloyd George, the Liberal prime minister of Great Britain in I believe 1908 or 1910, proposed to introduce legislation which was very progressive for that time he found that the House of Lords