

House who feel as strongly as he and I do that the Senate should be abolished. At any rate, I am glad to see that the minister has returned to the House even though he is sitting in the back row.

A few days ago I had a conversation with a senator who is a friend of mine. Believe it or not, there are some senators who are my friends because they know that my opposition to the Senate is to it as an institution and does not involve any feelings against any of Their Honours who are over there at the present time. At any rate, I asked this senator who is a friend of mine whether he would prefer to be reformed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or abolished by me. His answer was immediate. He said he would rather be abolished by me.

As we discussed the matter it became clear that one of the reasons he made that choice is that he feels, as I believe other senators do, that one of the most insulting suggestions that has ever been made to Their Honours in the other place is the proposal of the Prime Minister for Senate reform along the lines of seven-year appointments subject to reappointment. One might ask what would happen to a senator appointed when the Conservatives were in power, if that ever happens again, whose seven-year term should expire when the Liberals were in power. Would the Liberal prime minister say to a Conservative that he has been a good boy and therefore he would be reappointed, or would he pass him by?

For that matter, what would happen to the fortunes of a senator belonging to the party of the prime minister if that same prime minister had some cabinet member he wished to get rid of, or if there should be too many members waiting in the wings? What chance would there be for a firm appraisal of the job done in the other place by those who are there under this seven-year "you are in and then maybe you are out" proposal of the Prime Minister? I suggest that my argument for the outright abolition of the other place is much kinder than what is being proposed by the Prime Minister.

This is not the first time I have moved the second reading of this bill. It has seldom reached a vote, although on occasion it did. Even though one has not had success in persuading this House to support the abolition of the Senate, I think it is a point which should be considered very seriously. My basic reason, as I have already said, has nothing to do with the persons who are there, or who have been there in the past or who may be there in the future if the place continues.

My basic reason for being against the Senate is that I believe in democracy. To be even more precise, I believe in parliamentary democracy. I believe it is proper for the laws of the country to be made by persons elected by the people of Canada. That is what we are in this House. We are 264 individuals elected by the people of Canada. We can make mistakes, but if we make mistakes we must go back to the people during the next election and answer for our mistakes. We are responsible back to the people who sent us here.

The same situation does not exist in respect of the other place. Each one of them is appointed by the prime minister of the day. The actual constitutional arrangement is that the Governor General summons individuals to the Senate, but the Governor General acts on the advice of the prime

*British North America Act*

minister and on the advice of no one else. Therefore, when a person goes to the other place he has not been elected by the people. He is not responsible to any group of people. He is not even responsible to the prime minister who appointed him.

If a senator should be appointed now, he continues until age 75. If he was appointed before the law was changed, he is there as long as he lives. I do not know how anyone can justify that arrangement in the 1970s as being consistent with the principles of democracy and with the philosophy under which the laws of the country are made with the consent of the governed by persons who are responsible to those who sent them here.

I do not feel this is the time to reform the other place. It is not a time to change its rules, to change the method of appointment or to change the amount of work allotted to it. It is a time to face the fact that we are not in 1867 or in the century when the House of Lords seemed to be all right and we copied it. We are in the latter part of the twentieth century and getting close to the twenty-first century. Surely democracy has grown up and it is time for the country to be governed by the people through their elected representatives, and that means that nothing we do should be subject to veto by the other place.

I recognize that it is not very often the other place does veto anything done in this House of Commons. Many years ago Their Honours defeated the first old age pension bill. That alone struck me as strange, that at a time when they were on pension for life they thought \$20 a month in the form of a pension for ordinary Canadians was something which should not be accepted. There have been a half dozen cases since then on minor points when the Senate has vetoed something done in this House. There was one case during the last parliament when the Senate amended a bill sent over to it. It is true that once we rejected their amendment, they did not insist on it. The fact is, however, that they have the power. The fact that they do not use it only makes the existence of the place ridiculous.

I know that a great deal of work is done in the committees over there. It is done by a limited number. Perhaps 25 or 30 of those in the other place are working senators. I pay tribute to them. I am one of those who spend a good deal of time around this building. I am here many times on weekends when there are not many members around, but I see some of those working senators here and I know that they apply themselves conscientiously to the jobs that are given to them. They have produced some good reports on land use, on aging, on poverty, and so on. They have participated with members of this House in joint committees that have produced good reports. But the desirability of having 15, 20 or 30 individuals working on surveys or reports is surely no justification for keeping 102 individuals, not only on a rather expensive payroll but in a position where they have the right of veto over what is done in this House of Commons.

● (1710)

This is the basic philosophical approach that I take to the whole matter. I think there is just no place for a non-elected body in a democratic parliament in this latter part of the twentieth century. Some persons who go along