

position should nominate to the Prime Minister, whoever he might be, every third senator of that particular senatorial division. For instance, when a vacancy occurred in the West, the Government would fill it; when a second vacancy occurred, the Government would fill that also, but when a third vacancy occurred, the leader of the Opposition would give the name of the appointee to the leader of the Government, who would appoint every third man from the Opposition. The same thing would take place in Ontario, Quebec and the lower provinces. In this way, neither party would lose any of its patronage—the patronage would simply be carried over for a little. To my mind this would have two advantages. During the earlier years that I sat in this House when we were in power, there were in Opposition several men—one of them is in the House still, my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), the present senator George Taylor, and others, men who had spent twenty-five or thirty years of their lives working for the public, and who were going up in years, and I thought it would have been a splendid thing if the leader of the Opposition in those years had the power of every now and then nominating one of these men to the Senate. We would have lost a little of our patronage at the time, but we would have made it up to us now if that method of nomination were in force. We went out of power in 1911, and up to now I have never felt like giving voice to these views simply because hon. gentlemen opposite were in a minority in the Senate, and I would be the last man on earth to suggest that a party in a minority in the Senate should be asked to appoint any one but their own supporters in filling vacancies. But when the present vacancies are filled hon. gentlemen opposite will have a majority in the Senate, and I therefore throw out my suggestion for what it may be worth. If my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were in power I would speak very strongly upon this subject, and insist as far as I could on the Liberal party making a change as soon as we obtained a majority in the Senate. If every third man were appointed on the recommendation of the leader of the Opposition, it would certainly prevent the Senate from being so one-sided. I say 1 out of 3 just to illustrate my argument; that might not be the right proportion, but it shows the object I have in view. I think such a change would be in the interests of the

Senate itself, in the interests of the Government and in the interests of the country.

There is one other change I would like to see made in the Senate. I would provide that when a senator reaches a certain age, seventy-five say or any other age fixed upon, he should be superannuated and another man appointed in his place. In my opinion the Senate could be made a much more useful branch of the Government than it is at present. We all know that for weeks after this House assembles there is very little for the Senate to do until legislation goes up to them from this House.

Mr. MARCIL: They can initiate legislation.

Mr. TURRIFF: I was just coming to that. When a man attains the age of seventy-five or any other age that may be decided upon, and younger senators are appointed, I would give the Senate more work to do. Certain classes of legislation should be introduced in the Senate, and should come to this House thoroughly thrashed out and licked into shape. We know from experience that when legislation comes to this House from the Senate there is mighty little for us to do; it is a big help. If this suggestion were adopted I do not think there would be more than ten or fifteen senators that would have to be superannuated, and the cost would be trifling compared with the amount we would save in thus shortening the life of the session. I would provide by law that all legislation of a certain character, railway Bills, or all private Bills if you like, should be introduced in the Senate and thrashed out there before coming to us. I am satisfied that if something along this line was done, it would shorten the session by three or four weeks, and we would thereby save ten times as much as it would cost to superannuate the few senators who had reached the age limit. Even without superannuating any senators, I think more legislation should be initiated in the Senate with a view to shortening the length of the session.

Those are the two suggestions I have to make. As I said before, I did not want to make them until hon. gentlemen opposite had a majority in the Senate. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has brought the subject up, and while I do not quite agree with his views, I would like to see something done along these lines, as I am sure it would be a step in the right direction, and would give good results. I trust that my hon. friend who is leading