

for the position. It would be importing a wrong principle to recognize in the selection of those commissioners political divisions. It would tend to create strife in the Commission itself, and would not be for the good government of the country. I do not think that we should borrow from the United States. Their system is not at all similar to ours. The president can dismiss, and as a matter of fact has dismissed very readily, an official of that kind. Under our system, it is intended that the commissioners shall hold office as the Auditor General does, whether there is a change of government or not. They are intended to be permanent officials, to be removed only by a vote of both Houses. It is the correct principle, and in accordance with precedent, and we should not recognize qualifications arising purely from the political views of parties.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—The object of this Bill is to create public confidence as to appointments of our public servants. Patronage which has heretofore been exercised by the party in power and which they have discovered has been somewhat to their disadvantage is now being handed over to a Commission. An excellent opportunity is furnished in this Bill to the government to introduce not altogether a precedent, but a principle which should be well recognized in the public life of Canada. It has been the fortunate lot of this government since its accession to power to fill nearly all the great offices in Canada, and yet I venture to say that it would be difficult—I have in view at present the judiciary—in the many many appointments to the bench both superior and inferior to point to the name of any Conservative who has been selected. The bench has undergone almost an entire change since the accession of the present government to office, and I doubt if any hon. gentleman in this Chamber can put his finger on any judicial appointment that has been freely made from the opposition party. They have, with one or two exceptions, been selected from the party in power.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I should like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the government have recently appointed a chief justice in New Brunswick, and a chief justice in Nova Scotia, both of whom are Conservatives.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—They were not original appointments; they were promotions.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—What about Judge Phippen, of Winnipeg?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—The only reason they appointed Judge Phippen was that the provincial government demanded the appointment of a Conservative before they would proclaim the Act.

Hon. Mr. ROY—What about Judge Beck?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Judge Beck joined the Liberal party and was with the party at the time the Autonomy Bill was under consideration.

Hon. Mr. DOUGLAS—What about Judge Wetmore?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—He was appointed to the bench by the Conservative government, before he was appointed to the chief justiceship.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—What about Judge Nesbit?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—This government had an opportunity of showing a measure of disinterestedness in selecting political opponents for high judicial offices, but they did not do so. The same remark applies to the Railway Board, which is a quasi judicial body and to the National Transcontinental Railway Commission. In England it is entirely different. The party in power there, in making its high appointments, does not give consideration to the fact of the appointee belonging to the dominant party. They recognize the principle that if public confidence is to be created in the higher offices of the State, gentlemen must be selected from both political parties.

Hon. Mr. McSWEENEY—What about Chief Justice Barker, of New Brunswick?