

However, I have no objection to the suggested appointment of one or several senators as ministers without portfolio, because I feel that the presence of one or several of these ministers in this chamber would greatly contribute to improve the business of the Senate.

The senator's tenth recommendation deals with the representation of minority groups. I believe that what I have already said on the Senate role prompts me to accept this recommendation readily. I quite agree with the senator when he says that the Senate should reflect the multicultural character of the Canadian people.

I disagree entirely with the eleventh recommendation of the senator, namely that the chairmen of standing committees should hold office for one parliament only and that the age limit should be 65 years. I do agree, however, with that part of the recommendation, namely, that a senator should not be chairman of more than one Senate committee, whether it be standing or special. I understand that such a recommendation is consistent with the general practice of this house.

Finally, as regards the twelfth recommendation of Senator Croll, I quite agree that a standing committee on miscellaneous Canadian affairs should be set up. I even add that this committee's jurisdiction should not be limited in any way.

I believe that during his speech, Senator Croll expressed the wish of seeing in this house the partisan atmosphere of the Commons debates, what he called the "cut and thrust of politics." I hope that wish will not come true because I prefer the atmosphere of our peaceful debates during which members look fully into legislation with serenity, without spending their time in long partisan debates and straying from the legislation before them.

A wise, informed and experienced man once said that the difference between the debates in the House of Commons and those in the Senate was that in the other place members addressed the electorate or the public gallery, while in the Senate, speakers addressed themselves to the question.

I believe that it would be a disservice to this country if we were to take such a stand in this house. I know that the lack of partisan debates here deprives the Senate of a certain publicity in the mass media. I believe the publicity thus acquired would not be beneficial either to the Senate or to the Canadian people.

I leave now the speech of Senator Croll and I take the liberty of commenting on the remarks made by the other senators who took part in this debate.

Senator Manning suggested a considerable change in the role of the Senate by replacing its legislative role by a reduced role, the one of adviser to the House of Commons and investigator for the government. I think the acceptance of this change in the role of the Senate would lead to a drastic change in the whole Canadian parliamentary system, and this could not be done without the approval of the provinces. Such a change would be equivalent to a total denial of the role which the Fathers of Confederation assigned to this house and which I have underlined earlier.

I agree with the suggestion made by several senators and other public figures during the previous and present

discussions on Senate reform to the effect that the Canadian Senate should be entrusted with more investigations, especially those of the kind which are normally given to royal commissions. However, this investigative role, regardless of the importance of the investigations entrusted to the Senate, should not become the major role of this house and replace its present legislative role, with the special duty of the Senate to look after regional interests and particularly the vital interests of the various ethnic groups in this country.

May I digress here to point out the wrong comparison often made between the role of Canadian Senate and the part played formerly by provincial legislative councils.

First of all, it must be emphasized, as wrote Mr. Edmond Orban, a Quebec political scientist, and the author of a very interesting work on the Quebec legislative council, that it was because Sir Georges-Étienne Cartier insisted on giving Quebec a bicameral system that the Fathers of Confederation extended that system to the provincial legislatures. In fact, according to this author, Sir John A. Macdonald would have preferred for all the provinces to have only one chamber to show that they were a local or subordinate parliament. On the contrary, to Cartier, bicameralism was needed to better mark the autonomy and the distinct character of Quebec. He made it a matter of prestige and he won his point. He got the support of English-speaking people from Lower Canada who, although they did not really care for large legislatures, did consider the legislative council as an instrument that could protect their rights as a minority group. It was also Cartier who wanted the members of this Upper Chamber to be appointed rather than elected in order to curb the possible demagogic tendencies of their colleagues of the Lower Chamber. The author adds that Cartier was, in that respect, supported by the high clergy of the province of Quebec.

After reading Mr. Orban's work I came to the conclusion that the role played by the legislative councils was, in the mind of the Fathers of Confederation, very different from that of the Canadian Senate. First of all it was a local legislature having jurisdiction over limited territories, and essentially local problems. I see here, as did Mr. Orban, the reason why Sir John A. Macdonald was so strongly opposed to the recommendation of his colleague, Sir Georges-Étienne Cartier.

Some supporters of the abolition of the Canadian Senate have often argued that if legislative councils had been readily abolished everywhere in Canada and with the apparent approval of the people, it will be the same for the abolition of the Senate. I believe that such an argument is fallacious and does not take into account the great difference between the role of the Upper House as part of our federal parliamentary system and the role of an Upper House as part of a local parliamentary system with limited jurisdiction over restricted territories, and essentially local problems. I also believe that if Sir Georges-Étienne Cartier had managed to convince his colleague, Sir John A. Macdonald, that the establishment of a legislative council in Quebec was justified to guarantee the autonomy and the particular nature of the province of Quebec, we should not necessarily conclude that a second legislature in Quebec has played a leading and necessary part in the