

*Senate Role in Parliamentary System*

House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert)—Housing—inquiry as to allowances; the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Consumer Affairs—alleged misleading advertising by Imperial Tobacco Company; the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Dumont)—External Affairs—Nigeria-Canadian action following ceasefire.

Order, please. It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, notices of motions.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF MOTIONS

### THE SENATE

#### MOTION TO ESTABLISH COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE ROLE IN PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the appointment of a Special Committee of this House which shall have the power to hold hearings in various parts of Canada, take testimony and hire experts, with the following terms of reference: That it shall examine the role of the Senate within Parliament and in its general constitutional functions and report with recommendations on whether the Senate should continue as it has been and is, or whether it should be abolished (and if so, by what means) or whether some form of reformed Senate is worth while (and if so, what reforms).

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Having read the motion to the House, I feel it is incumbent upon the Chair to draw the attention of the House to the fact that a decision has been taken with respect to one of the provisions in this proposed motion.

• (5:00 p.m.)

On December 16 last, the House negatived a motion for second reading of Bill C-18, which bill proposed the abolition of the Senate. Having made that statement, I refer hon. members to citation 194 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. I will read it in part:

A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which has already been decided, because a proposition being once submitted and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House.

In view of the provisions of that citation I will allow the debate to proceed, but it could

be difficult for the House to reach a point where a decision might be taken. However, I think in all fairness to the hon. member and in view of the fact that in part his motion goes beyond the specific point, dealt with in Bill C-18, I will allow the debate at this time.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, in spite of the decision which was made last month, I want to make it clear that as I move this resolution I am, have been, and will continue to be a believer in the abolition of the Senate. The reason I moved the resolution in the form in which I did was that I realized it was unlikely the House would approve a resolution calling for the outright abolition of the Senate. That being the case, it seemed to me possible that the House might be willing to approve a resolution which gave consideration to the appointment of a committee to study, not just the question of whether or not the Senate should be abolished, but how the Senate could be reconstituted to make a better contribution to the democratic life of this country.

Anybody who studies the evolution of the democratic system in society, whether it be in Canada, Great Britain, France or any other country, will quickly realize that second chambers such as the Senate or the House of Lords are actually the survivors of a pre-democratic age. They are survivors of feudal institutions and constitutions which were in effect in medieval Europe before democratic systems such as we know them came into existence. The upper houses in most countries in early generations represented not faith in democracy but a hedge against democracy. The House of Lords in Great Britain was the bulwark of privilege and property, while the House of Commons was the protagonist of the rights of the people. I suggest that anyone who looks at the books which have been written about the Canadian Senate will come to the conclusion that the same is true of our upper house.

Robert MacKay in his book "The Unreformed Senate of Canada" said that of 308 Senators who served in the Senate of Canada from 1925 to 1963, 71 per cent were recruited from the realm of law, business and agriculture. Professional fields such as medicine, engineering, education and journalism, not to mention the very substantial percentage of Canadian people one can classify as workers or labour, have been grossly under-represented in the membership of the Senate.

If one looks at the Parliamentary Guide and considers individual Senators, one can