

committee, a senator should be under 65. It would be sheer folly, from the point of view of perhaps a younger member of this chamber, to deny ourselves and the country the competence, skill, wisdom and experience that senators who have passed the age of 65 can bring to bear on particular problems—and here I am thinking of Senator Croll himself, Senator Hayden, Senator O'Leary, and others.

I had the privilege a few years ago to serve on a royal commission, two members of which were over the age of 70. They were two of the youngest minds it has been my privilege to serve with. I do not think youth has any monopoly on wisdom. I have found old men of 40 and young men of 75, and I take issue with that proposal, as I do not think it is in the best interests of the Senate or the country to support it.

Honourable senators, I do not agree with Senator Croll's view that the Speaker, the Government leader and the Opposition leader should be elected by the members of this house. This is an appointed chamber, and I find it inconsistent to talk about electing these officers. The Leader of the Government in the Senate should be the choice of the government. He should be someone in whom the government has confidence. We should have a relationship or liaison with the Cabinet by which we can express our concerns and views, and the senator who performs that function and that of transmitting information back to us must have the confidence of the cabinet. I have mixed views on whether the government leader should have the support of another member of this chamber as a member of the cabinet, but we should do everything we can to make the Senate a more effective body.

I do not agree with the view that the Government leader and the Opposition leader should serve for only one Parliament, and not be eligible for re-election. They should serve for the Parliament, but then should be eligible for re-election. A determination should then be made on their competence, their work, and their performance. If they are worthy of re-election, they should be entitled to re-election.

I am afraid I do not agree with Senator Croll's eighth suggestion, that the Government leader in the Senate should not be a member of the Cabinet. It is very important that he should be a member of the Cabinet, and we should not fall into the trap of promoting further isolation, further removal, of the Senate as a part of the parliamentary system. There are two houses, but a single Parliament. We should maintain very strong ties and should not allow any separation in that regard.

Senator Lapointe made a point about minority groups being under-represented in the Senate. That is true, and there is need for a broader input of Canada as we know it from the various sections. When I look around I do not see very many—I was going to say "working men," but there are many working men here—trade union representatives in the chamber. There are other groups also that are under-represented and it would make for a chamber more reflective of the Canadian people if that very valid point were implemented.

Senator Croll suggested that the chairmen of standing committees should not be eligible for re-election. I agree that they should serve for one Parliament, but on merit

they should certainly be eligible for re-election. We should not deny ourselves the competence and calibre of such people with proven records of ability and understanding of the committee function.

The final recommendation in Senator Croll's list of twelve is that there should be constituted a standing Senate committee on miscellaneous Canadian affairs to deal with various matters such as he enumerates. It is my opinion that that has considerable merit and is something that should be considered.

What troubles me is our tendency to allow ourselves to be intimidated. We have almost fallen into the trap of "going along," and one subject no one likes to talk about is that of salaries. I think it was a mistake on the part of this chamber to agree that there should be a different scale of either salary or expenses from that of the other house. I do not accept the view that constituents in the various parts of the country we represent are concerned only with going to MPs, and that the costs or expenses of MPs are greater than those of members of the Senate.

I do not know how this affects other senators, but I presume their experience is the same as mine. I receive many complaints, grievances and problems of a federal nature that people in my community want me to raise in Ottawa. It would be easy for me to tell them to go and see their MP, but have I the right to do that? Is it not my responsibility to deal with those problems on their behalf when I have the opportunity to do so? It is not a question of dollars as such but it is a question of eroding the prestige of this body and lessening its function. A case can be made for equal pay for equal work. Perhaps it is of a different style or different form, but we should not allow ourselves to fall into the trap of agreeing to any lesser salary or expense schedule than that which applies to the other house.

I have read in recent weeks, as I am sure everyone has, about the possibility of establishing constituency offices at an additional cost of \$6,000 or \$8,000 a year. If that should be proposed, then as good a case can be made for members of this house to have offices of a similar type established. Perhaps this is the weak link. We are talking about communication with constituents, and we should be more readily available to hear and deal with their problems. A constituent's problem may very well be a matter for referral to his or her elected member of Parliament, but there are matters that we can properly deal with and for which we have a responsibility.

On the question of salaries, the honourable senator who spoke just ahead of me talked about its being somewhat of a part-time job to be here. Yes, it is, but many people would find that they simply could not afford to live totally on the salary of a senator. If this is to be a full-time job then we must think in terms of substantially raising the salaries in both houses and making it possible for a parliamentarian to devote the whole of his time to his duties, although I do not particularly share the view that this should be a full-time job.

It is important that members of this chamber should represent involvement throughout the community and in all the various facets of the economy—the professions, labour and management. It is important that members of this chamber should have been involved on a day-to-day