

# Through a Monocle

## The Pending Senatorial Appointments

By THE MONOCLE MAN.

THE Dominion Government has the privilege and the responsibility of naming an unusual number of new Senators before Parliament meets. I think the appetizing total is sixteen, including the additional "seigniors" who are expected to come down from the West. Sixteen will make quite an appreciable contribution to the ranks of a House whose proportion of active members is not large; and the Government has thus a chance to win the admiration and applause of the country by making this "sweet sixteen" something remarkable and record-breaking in the way of mental stature and public service. Usually Senators are named singly or in dribblets. This makes it difficult for the best-intentioned Government to carry through any definite plan of Senate Reform. Their area of contact with the problem at any given time is so small that they cannot produce an appreciable effect; and to maintain a policy of high-class non-partisan appointments over a term of years, in the teeth of all the "cadging" and coaxing and coercion of the alleged "friends" who gather about every Government, would be a titanic task.

\*\*\*

BUT to-day the Government can launch a genuine measure of Senate Reform by appointing none but statesmen of Senatorial stature to the Chamber we call—more in hope than in confidence—the Upper House. By this one act, the relations of our two Houses of Parliament might be instantly and materially affected. At present, the Commons is so entirely dominant that we hardly consider the Senate at all. At times, it reminds us of its existence by some annoying act—such as the killing of the Tariff Commission Bill last session; but when we are reckoning the course of politics or the chances of any policy, we think always of the Commons and practically never of the Senate. This is to a considerable extent due to the fact that the Commons is elected while the Senate is appointed; and, to this extent, it is incurable until we get an elective Senate. But much might be done to redress the balance and give the Senate more weight if the appointive power were used to seat in the Upper Chamber the sort of men who would be elected from large Senatorial districts.

THIS sort of man is easily defined. He is big enough to be seen by the people over a large area—an area much larger than the Commons constituency. He is a man who commands public respect and confidence. He is a man who can serve the country effectively in its Senate. There occasionally arise kid-gloved councillors who appear to have the notion that what is wanted in the Senate is a collection of College Presidents or be-spectacled book-worms or "superior persons" of some sort who could not be elected to the smallest office which the people control. They are "too good" to be appreciated by the common herd. With this top-lofty idea—though it may go in some minds with the wearing of a "Monocle"—I wholly disagree. We should never put to rule over the people any set of men whom the people would not themselves choose. It is only as the Government succeed in appointing to the Senate the sort of men whom the great majority of the people would like to elect there—and whom they would elect there under an elective system if they were not ham-strung and tied down by party—that the Government will succeed in giving the Senate popular power.

\*\*\*

A SENATE of "high-brows" would be no more effective than the House we now possess. The people would think that it was very cultured and intellectual; but they would pay no attention to its opinions touching practical matters. When it took an attitude hostile to the majority of the Commons, the plain citizen would usually be impatient—that is all. If the issue were important, he might be angry and talk of wiping out the Chamber altogether. Yet a Senate will never be worth its salt until its challenge of the opinion of the majority of the House of Commons is taken seriously by the country, and will immediately put the House of Commons on the defensive. There should be so much general confidence in the judgment of the Senate—given additional "kudos" by its freedom from party fanaticism and its patriotic disinterestedness—that a rejection of a Government bill by that body would make people ask—"What is wrong with

the Bill?" Now they say—"The Old Ladies of the Senate are playing politics."

\*\*\*

OF course, my policy is an elective Senate from large constituencies. But, pending that, what we have to deal with is an appointive Senate; and I feel that the Government have to-day an unrivalled chance to immensely augment the prestige of the Upper House. They have a chance, indeed, that they may value more than that. They can practically get a majority in the Senate by these sixteen appointments, though they would still be in a minority so far as the mere counting of noses went. They could get this "majority" by naming Senators of such weight in the country that their united opinion in support of any measure would make it politically unprofitable for the mechanical majority of their opponents to exercise their right to reject that measure. And the moment it becomes politically unprofitable for a party majority to do a thing it will not do it—if it has its eyes open. Of course, such a body of weighty Senators might embarrass certain mercenary politicians of the "baser sort" even on the Government side. These Senators would reject their bad measures, even if they had passed the Commons. But this would be quite as good a thing for the Government as it would be to have its worthy measures carried through the Senate in spite of numerical weakness.

\*\*\*

I SHOULD think that this suggestion of mine would appeal to all practical politicians. It would save the Senate for them. At present, they are in great danger of losing it; and it amounts to a tidy bit of "patronage." They will lose it forever if it once becomes an elective body; and an elective body it will become if Governments continue to make the sort of appointments they have been all too prone to make in the past. But its life as an appointive body can be lengthened by conspicuously good appointments. "But"—the politicians will say—"what benefit will it be for us to keep it if we must always make good appointments?" Ah-h. I had not thought of that. Perhaps, it wouldn't. But it would rejoice any statesman, who may be in sight, to see the Senate raised to real Senatorial dignity.

## Socialism in United States Politics

An Estimate of "Bill" Haywood of the I. W. W.

By A NEW-YORK-CANADIAN

says, "I fear the equal opportunity which those seek who proclaim the coming of so called social

A Socialistic Agitator



William D. Haywood, who has been arrested for threatening a general strike in the United States if Ettore and Giovannitti are not released from prison.

POLITICS make strange bed-fellows. Socialism goes one better and puts all politicians into one bed.

At least, with the initiative, the referendum, the recall; old age pensions, workmen's insurance, universal suffrage and other Socialist measures—the stock in trade of politicians of all stripes; with two real parties outbidding each other in schemes for the improvement of social conditions and a fairer division of the profits of labour, we have come upon a fellowship of political interests that suggests nothing so much as the homely but hospitable four-poster of the proverb.

But let no gibing cynic underestimate the strength or sincerity of the social undercurrents which the politicians have been so quick to recognize and so eager to turn to their own political account. The movement is something more than a spasm of reform—moral or economic; something more than mere jetsam and flotsam on the tides of human progress. It represents the aspirations of the masses for a larger participation in government and a larger control of the sources of wealth and production. It is a movement for higher national purity, of course, but in contrast to similar reform movements, it goes to the root of our national debauchery—capitalistic control of the channels of legislation. It challenges our entire social and industrial system. It involves our whole theory of government. In a word it is—SOCIALISM.

NO less an authority than President Taft, in his speech of acceptance, took occasion to warn the nation, in language altogether innocent of subtlety, that both his political opponents were heading in this direction. "In the ultimate analysis," he

justice, involves a forced division of property, and that means, Socialism." In the present whereabouts of public sentiment, this already sounds like a voice from the past. Who "those" are, the President leaves us in no doubt, although with characteristic fairness, he accuses neither of "consciously embracing Socialism." But if not actually professed, Socialism is widely confessed, and Socialist ideals brought prominently into the realm of practical politics.

What is it that has so suddenly quickened Socialism into this activity? Made the Democratic and Bull Moose platforms competitors for Socialist planks and struck such terror into the heart of the nation's President? What has brought on the social revolution?

AMERICA is not revolutionary. Socialism is not new. Evils of capitalist combinations have been exposed in muck-raking articles until we have wearied of the repetition. The social blight of poverty and disease we have accepted as by-products of a civilization in which we gloried. Capitalist control of the channels of legislation and of the courts we have contemplated with cynical indifference. We have seen public domain exploited for private greed; white slavery protected; news throttled in the interest of guilty trusts and facetiously called it graft. Child labour and woman labour have become the commonplaces of our industrial life. We have seen the church, if not in open alliance with capital, silent upon its crimes. It has even had the blasphemy to quote the Founder's "The poor ye have with you always" in justification. In a word we have calmly confessed our helplessness in the face of conditions that should be a stench in the nostrils of decent men.