

Before I close, there is another suggestion which I should like to make, on two grounds: first, on that of economy, and secondly, to improve our parliamentary institutions, the latter being the more important. Everyone is aware of the great interest that is being centred in the other chamber of parliament at present, and I am going to suggest that the time has come to bring in a measure of real Senate reform. The opinion is being strengthened by recent disclosures that some action should be taken if our parliamentary institutions are to hold the respect to which they are entitled. The leaders of both parties in the Senate, at the beginning of this session, stressed the fact that the Senate was and should be a judicial body. With this I heartily agree. But, Mr. Speaker, how can it function as a judicial body when the party spirit is fanned and kept alive amongst its members? We find that both the old parties go to that body for their chief political party organizers. We find senators taking part in political campaigns, and the party spirit is kept at such a pitch that when a matter of grave concern comes up for decision, a decision which may cast a reflection on one party or the other, then that decision is not made on judicial but on strictly party lines. Therefore I am going to suggest, first, as a measure of economy, that our constitution be changed, cutting down the number of Senators from ninety-six to fifty-two, allowing six senators for each province, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, which would retain four as at present. The United States, with a population of 120,000,000, have only ninety-six senators, or two for each state irrespective of size or population. Secondly, to eliminate partyism and get a more judicial body, I would suggest: first, that the dominion and the provinces each have the right to appoint half the number. Secondly, that when a person accepts the position of senator he be disfranchised and not allowed to take part in any political activities, a position similar to that occupied by our judges. Thirdly, that senators be not appointed for life, as at present, but that a retiring age of seventy-five be established. I have not the time to go into details but I believe that if these suggestions were carried out the Senate might serve a very useful purpose as a judicial body and would come to be held in high esteem by the people of Canada.

Mr. ARTHUR DENIS (St. Denis) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I must, first express my astonishment in seeing our Conservative friends so garrulous, for they deprived us

during eighteen months of the pleasure of listening to their speeches. The government must be very unrestful, to be obliged to call upon its followers to help out its policy which has placed the country in such a critical situation.

We must, sir, congratulate ourselves and, at the same time, congratulate the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) for having appointed a Finance Minister which we requested on behalf of the people's rights. We regret, however, that the new Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) has to bear all the economic and unconstitutional blunders committed by his predecessor. The first act registered by his predecessor was to abolish the former tariff commission whose members, with all due deference to our Conservative friends, were better qualified than the Prime Minister to decide upon questions relating to customs. Their advice would have been of great assistance to him, however, he was deprived of it. It is true that, shortly after, he found out his error since he created a new commission similar to the former one. We still await the appointment of its members; no doubt it will come with time. Meanwhile let us be satisfied with the appointment of the Minister of Finance. The Prime Minister is to be congratulated, as he has been very fortunate in his choice. We must now caution the hon. Minister of Finance not to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor; otherwise we are lost and the future of the country is forever endangered. I am aware that hon. members opposite do not share these views, blinded as they are by party spirit and satisfied with temporarily feeding in the manger.

I listened to a number of their speeches. Their attitude can be explained. They accepted the budget such as it was. A different stand would have compelled them to admit with us that their administration had not been very flourishing, that our national debt had greatly increased since the country was under their régime, that our trade had alarmingly dwindled owing to their high protective tariff, which resulted in helping the manufacturers to realize unfair profits to the detriment of the workmen, whom they threw on the streets, depriving them entirely of their purchasing power. Thus the consumers were burdened with new liabilities and must pay additional taxes to cover the deficit resulting from the protection granted to a privileged class of a protectionist government which, at present, directs our destinies. They would also be forced to acknowledge the deficits which the government must cover by levying new taxes or increasing some of the old ones,