

before the House; but I believe if we were to adopt the idea of the hon. gentleman from Shediac, partyism would be found to increase very rapidly in the Senate. The men appointed by the local governments would be bound to support the parties appointing them. Then again, we would be introducing the system which is adopted in the United States, where the different states of the Union have the appointment of senators. I, as one humble member of this Senate, will object with all my power to having any part of the system of the United States introduced into our parliament. The senators of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying, instead of being responsible to the people of that country are simply the nominees of the combines, the trusts, and the moneyed men. They actually represent the money of the United States. Can you expect to have an independent body, when its members are appointed in that manner? The present United States Senate shows this very clearly. We have an independent body here—being appointed by the Crown, independent of all influences outside the Senate. It is not so with the Senate of the United States. The hon. gentleman from Wolseley (Hon. Mr. Perley) suggested an idea of appointing senators which, certainly, was novel, but I do not believe he will get very much support for his scheme. It was that the leader of the government should appoint eight members of his cabinet, that the leader of opposition would appoint six of the wisest men he could select, and that the chief justice of the province in which the appointment was to be made would select three. These men would cast a ballot for the senator. You will notice that the chief justice would have the appointment of the three men, who would constitute the majority of the electing body. They would hold the balance of power, and the result would be that we would have an element here which is very useful in its place, but which I think would be better to keep in the minority. We would have the House filled full of lawyers. I do not think it would be possible to carry out the hon. gentleman's idea in any way. I think it would be a complete failure in comparison with the way in which senators are at present appointed. My own idea is that, if we depart from the present

system, we had better go direct to the electorate and be elected say on a property qualification for a value of \$500 or \$1,000. Let half the Senate be elected every 5, 6 or 8 years, as may be considered best. At the end of that time let the other half be elected. This would give senators a tenure of ten or twelve years, which would be sufficiently long to show whether a man was a capable man for the Senate or not. If he was a very capable man and a very good man he would then have the opportunity of being re-elected. This is the course I would prefer if any of the plans are to be adopted which are suggested here; but I cannot see that there is any benefit in a system of direct election. We would have an interminable number of elections. We have already elections for the House of Commons, elections for the local legislature, civic and municipal elections, and I think these are quite enough without having the Senate elected. You would have some 44 or 45 senators elected every 5 or 6 years, but that would not include all the elections, because there would be quite a number of by-elections. Since the present government came into power ten years ago Sir Wilfrid Laurier has had the appointment of from 55 to 60 senators—55 at all events, there may have been a few more. 5 to 6 every year; 47 of these were to replace Conservatives, and eight to replace Liberals. This shows that we have from 5 to 6 by-elections every year, which would be a nuisance. I cannot, therefore, consent to the idea that if we were elected it would be a better system than we have at the present time. I cannot see but that the Prime Minister with his cabinet, they being advised by the members and senators from the locality in which the senator is to be appointed, can make just as good selections as under any system of direct election. Then we have to take into consideration the experience and the wisdom of the fathers of confederation when they adopted this system. They certainly thought they were adopting the system best calculated to meet the needs of the country, and I think it would be wise on our part to follow what they have done, and keep it in existence. We are not very much troubled with partyism in the Senate. We see it spring up occasionally, but not to a very great extent. Any hon. gentleman who has sat in this