

The Senate

body sitting a few hundred feet over there and we have not had the decency to bury the corpse. Instead, we have been looking for a purpose for that corpse. That does not make any sense at all. Let us bury the corpse, and if after that we want to create some new institution, let us do it, but let us get rid of that dead body first.

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a word or two in connection with this motion. It is somewhat similar to the motion on Friday, which I had the chance to speak to, asking the Government to present a motion for reform. Today we have another motion asking that the Government convene a federal-provincial conference to deal with the whole question of Senate reform.

On Friday I outlined my views with respect to the whole question of reforming the Senate. Those who were here or read *Hansard* will know that I felt the whole issue turned on the question of democracy and accountability. I suggested that there were four ways the Senate could be reformed. The first would be to tinker with it and change the powers of the Senate. That of course would not create accountability on the part of the Senate, and for that reason I rejected it. The second way was to change the method of appointing people to the Senate. Once again that would not create any accountability on the part of Senators and therefore I rejected that as well. The third method was election to the Senate. I pointed out that if we had two elected bodies we would run into a great problem as far as our constitutional form of democracy is concerned. We would create a situation of instability, a situation which existed in France before former President De Gaulle came into power. We do not want that. So that led inevitably to the fourth option, and that was—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lapierre: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre) on a point of order.

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you might take it upon yourself to explain to the new Member what happens to the motion if he speaks until six o'clock. I should like to have your guidance, Mr. Speaker, so as to—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It must be assumed that the Hon. Member is aware of the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. Redway: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

The fourth option was abolishing the Senate altogether. That certainly is the option I would go for. I think the only way to deal with the Senate is to abolish it.

The motion we have before us today has to do with the method of actually amending the Constitution in order to deal with reforming the Senate. As you know, Mr. Speaker, there is a procedure set out in the Constitution to deal with this situation.

The first step was referred to by the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre). He referred to a different number, but I believe Section 38(1) of the Act talks about the method of amending the Constitution, requiring that there be a proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada authorized by a resolution of the House of Commons, a resolution of the Senate, and by resolution of the Legislative Assemblies of at least two thirds of the provinces having an aggregate of 50 per cent of the population. My friend pointed out as well that Section 47 of that same legislation refers to the fact that the Senate cannot hold up that resolution for more than 180 days. My friend referred to 280 days but the legislation actually says 180 days.

First of all we start off with the proposition that an amendment can be made with a resolution of this House and a resolution of the Senate. The Senate cannot delay the resolution for more than 180 days. Then we require the resolutions of some seven legislatures representing 50 per cent of the population. That proposition has been questioned recently in the press and, as I understand it, by lawyers with the Department of Justice. They suggest that we would require the unanimous approval of all the legislatures and the Senate because we are talking about changing one of the elements of approval itself, that being the Senate. It is my feeling that that is not the case, particularly when you look at Sections 41 and 42 of the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION (A) DOMTAR—NEGOTIATION
OF SOLUTIONS BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND PREMIER
LÉVESQUE. (B) DOMTAR—MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in the debate during the time set aside for private Members and to tell the House how disappointed I was in the answer I was given by the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens) on March 11 of this year, upon his return from his trip around the world. I was disappointed, because he appeared in the House and repeated the press release he had issued before he left.

Mr. Speaker, I have the impression, as the Hon. Member opposite says, that the Minister has not understood.