

*The Constitution*

with the problems of the Senate. What the Government is suggesting is not much of a change at all. It is not suggesting much of a reform.

As was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner), even the great filibuster—as perceived by the Government—with respect to the borrowing authority legislation lasted for only 37 days. In other words, the reform proposed in the Bill before us would not change that much. For that matter, it would somehow rationalize the idea that the Senate could actually drag out each money Bill for 30 days without criticism, since that will be acceptable if the Bill before us passes. By setting what might be called maximum hours, or days, the Senate is being told that it has a legitimate right to spend 30 days on each money Bill and 45 days on each other piece of legislation. In the Senate, one hour quite often equals one day. That is one reason I object to the so-called reform.

The real reason I object to the so-called reform is that it is not reform at all. We are keeping a house of patronage. It is very much like another type of house. We are not saying that it is needed. We are saying it exists, therefore, we will put up with it. If it gets in our way, then we will bash through a constitutional amendment to deal with it. However, there is no attempt being made to reform it.

The Hon. Member has said there is no chance of abolition. Just five or six years ago people were saying there was no chance of our having our own Charter of Rights. At one time, people were saying there was no chance of us ever having an amending formula in this country. The only chance we have to abolish the Senate is for the Government to say that it is not doing anything, it is aware of that and it is not needed for a place of patronage. The Government must decide to bring a resolution to the House which will set out the fact that we do not need a Senate. If the Government has the courage to do something like that, then watch the provinces. Most of the Premiers in Canada are Conservatives. Watch them try to go to their people and defend the Senate.

**Mr. Nickerson:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has put great store in democracy. I do not blame him for doing this. However, great thinkers on constitutional affairs have always maintained that the democratic element should be balanced within a constitution, in line with other elements. Not only should we listen to the mob, as the Hon. Member has described them, but there should also be an element in Government filled by those most skilled at Government. There should exist an element which can be provided by those who have expertise in statesmanship. A monarchial element should also be part of a constitution. Does the Hon. Member put his whole store in the democratic element within a constitution; or does he agree with Socrates, Sir Robert Walpole and Dave Nickerson that there ought to be other elements, too?

**Mr. Murphy:** I can certainly not support the views of the last person mentioned by the Hon. Member. The other two persons he mentioned lived quite a long time ago. Perhaps the Hon. Member is also thinking in the past.

There is not a second Chamber in the Province of Ontario, nor is there one in the Province of Manitoba. There are not second Chambers in any of the provinces in the land. I do not feel that the people are any worse off because of the fact that there is not some type of unappointed group, be they statesmen or political hacks. We can survive quite well with democratic rule. We can survive with people who have been elected by the population and who are responsible to it. My reference to mob rule was in connection with John A. Macdonald's phrase "mob rule". My phrase would be "democratically-elected representation".

**Mr. Jardine:** Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter into the debate but, rather, to sit and listen to the comments of my learned colleague. However, I really must comment when he brings into question and casts a dark pall on the reputation and integrity of literally all members of the Upper Chamber. These are distinguished Canadians of whom he is speaking. I would particularly like to mention one of note, and that is the Senator from Riverview, New Brunswick, who was recently appointed. She has contributed to the province through 13 years of public service and is more than prepared and willing to continue that kind of contribution to the rest of Canada. I would have to ask the Hon. Member if he really believes that through the years the Senate has existed, it has made no contribution whatsoever to Canada.

● (1550)

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, in my speech, I mentioned that in the past, some of the committees of the Senate have provided some useful information and have done some useful studies. I also went on to point out that that role by and large has been taken over by the House of Commons with the number of task forces that we have set up over the last few years to look into things such as the problems of the disabled and pensioners and federal-provincial relations and the like.

In my speech and in response to the two Hon. Members who asked questions of me, I was very careful not to impugn the dignity of any one Senator. I am arguing that a body that sat on May 1 for 20 minutes and on April 30 for two hours and five minutes, the longest it sat in a five-week period, despite the credentials of the individuals within it, no longer has a place in the Canadian democratic system.

Those individuals, including the one to whom the Hon. Member made mention, could do a much better job for their own personal reputation and for Canada if we found other roles for them to play within our system. They have made a great contribution in the past and they could do so in the future, but the other House is not the place for that contribution.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, I am a bit concerned about the arguments that the Hon. Member is making. He went to great lengths to describe the amount of time that Senators spend sitting in the Senate considering legislation. I would submit that the Hon. Member is being intellectually dishonest by