

*Tenure of Senators*

which to persuade or dissuade the electorate would, I think, be pretty naive.

As the Hon. Member has said, there is no question that those who are thinking about Senate reform want accountability. As well, they overwhelmingly reject patronage. I believe they were simply saying to the committee that if we could not as a committee, a Government and a part of a constitutional process effect significant Senate reform, then we might as well abolish it. I think that was the difference between what the committee heard as evidence and what was contained in the seven, eight or nine reports. I myself was a member of the committee which dealt with Bill C-60.

Attitudes have hardened and I believe that that is the difference between this report and previous reports. I think many of the institutions of Government have fallen into some disrepute. I think there is a cynicism and suspicion that exists, and that is natural for a population suffering economic pressures. This cynicism and suspicion has resulted in a hardening of attitudes, and there are very few people other than several here in Ottawa who would be great defenders of the present Senate system.

I would like to deal with my concern about, to use the Hon. Member's words, "provincial involvement in the Senate process". We must be extremely careful at least to attempt to differentiate between the involvement of people who live in a province and the involvement of provincial Governments in the Senate process. Those two things are dramatically different. It is simply too trite to say that because a provincial Government has been elected, it should be directly involved in the Senate appointment process. I have always had grave difficulty with provincial appointments. Again, I do not wish to be too cynical, but let us be realistic. Say that I am a premier of a certain province and I have a Cabinet Minister who has outlived his usefulness, is causing me trouble or is a threat to my leadership, and I have the power of appointment.

**Mr. Bloomfield:** Put him in the Senate.

**Mr. Jarvis:** As my friend, the Hon. Member for London-Middlesex (Mr. Bloomfield), just said, I would solve the problem by putting him in the Senate. I would do the same thing to my fund raiser who had made too many calls to the same well.

I believe it goes deeper than that, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that a provincial Government which has successfully sought from its electorate a mandate on a certain set of issues has *ipso facto* or automatically a mandate to involve itself directly in the appointment of a person to a federal institution. Unless senate appointments were part of the campaign issues of that Government, its electorate has given it a mandate to act within the boundaries of that particular province.

I believe that I as a member of the committee and all members of the committee diligently sought an alternate and more acceptable form of an appointed Senate. It was not to be found. I can say to the Hon. Member for Edmonton East, that with respect to regional representation, it was made clear to us by witness after witness that in the minds of Canadians a

region is now a province. It is not the western region or the Atlantic region or the maritime region. A region is a province. I think we should forget all about lumping Manitoba and Saskatchewan together or lumping two or four of the Atlantic provinces together. We should forget that because it is not going to work.

I am absolutely convinced that when people now talk in terms of regions, they talk in terms of provinces. That is why, instead of proportional representation or election at large within a province to the Senate, we recommended a senatorial district or whatever it might be called. Those of us from Ontario, and I am sure those from other provinces, know that there are extraordinary differences in the interests, ambitions, prejudices, fears, hopes and aspirations of those who live in rural southwestern Ontario and those who live in metropolitan Toronto. Even more dramatically, those who live in northern Ontario from North Bay up to James Bay have different interests. I am sure the same is true in every province. Therefore, we said to ourselves that if we need greater regional representation in the Senate, then we cannot do so by election at large or by using a list of eligible candidates from our particular Party from the Province of Ontario. If we have as our pillar the principle of greater regional representation, then we must carve the regions into districts.

Frankly, I would be one of the first to support having this Bill go to committee if I were convinced that it would act as an effective lever to get the provincial premiers and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to the bargaining table. If that is all that it accomplished, it would be worthwhile. There is no question about that. We in the committee had serious doubts about using that kind of lever. We are very anxious for the next First Ministers' Conference to see if anyone will take the initiative to put it on the table. We have some hope that the premiers, who have their annual conference I believe in August of each year—just the provincial premiers, no federal Government involvement—will put it on the agenda for the next conference.

● (1750)

With respect to the Hon. Member's remarks that no reform had occurred because the package was too large to swallow, he may be right. There is no question about the present report; it is a package. It is a package and it is inextricably interrelated—an elected nine-year term senatorial district. It is very hard to carve out the pieces, pull out the district and put in proportional representation. One will find that argument very flawed if one accepts the regional representation argument. It is very, very flawed. That concerned me deeply with respect to the reply of the Prime Minister. I do not think that the Government has thought through those three principles and how they were interrelated. I appreciated receiving the reply of the Prime Minister well before the time required for that reply.

I certainly hope that the subject matter raised today by the Hon. Member for Edmonton East will be the subject matter for further debate and, particularly, I hope that it is a matter