

Canada and represent them in the red chamber with grace and distinction.

One other point worth repeating, before I discuss reform of the Senate, is that the Senate is one of the few places in an increasingly crude and abrasive world where courtesy and graciousness are the rule rather than the exception.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Cameron: Now to Senate reform. Yes, I believe that certain reforms would make the Senate a more vigorous, useful and respected place than it is now, and I give this opinion on the basis of limited experience and observation.

First, I believe there should be some other than a party basis for appointment. The former Liberal Government made a move in this direction or I, for one, would not be in the Senate, though I have always claimed to be a small "l" liberal. However, I believe there should be two types of senators—and I am quoting from what I wrote in 1958, and I wish to modify it later—those appointed from the political parties, from all parties in proportion to their voting strength, and those appointed for distinguished service in the arts, humanities, social sciences, science and public service. Being realistic, I think that the political appointments should predominate, because under our present party system the Government in power, which has the responsibility for governing, must have a core of people who share its views to take the responsibility of piloting the Government's legislation through the Senate.

My view at that time was that out of the 102 seats in the Senate, 80 should be divided among the party appointments, and that the remainder should be on a non-political basis. I am not one of those who deplore partisan and political views sincerely held and freely expressed. I think an injection of political partisanship in the Senate, so long as it is not overdone, adds interest to proceedings in the chamber, and I would be sorry to see a sterile neutrality.

That statement was made in January 1958. I would modify it today by saying that I think appointments to the Senate should be of three kinds: First, I would reserve 22 of the 102 places in the Senate for men and women who have distinguished themselves and made a contribution to Canada in the arts, humanities, business or public affairs, these appoint-

ments to be made regardless of party affiliation. Second, of the remaining 80 Senate appointments, 40 should be reserved to the federal Government. Third, the remaining 40 seats should be allocated on the basis of a proportionate population division by the provincial governments.

I recognize that the suggestion I am making with respect to the abolition of the time-honoured method of making Senate appointments is political heresy, and as such may lead to my excommunication and burning at the stake. However, I have sat in this chamber under both Liberal and Conservative governments and one of the things that has pleased me most in the Senate's approach to the dispatch of public business is how little part narrow political partisanship has played.

I am confident that a Senate constituted along lines similar to those I have outlined would not only appeal to the provinces, but no government would have undue cause to fear that the Senate would obstruct its program of sound legislation. It might improve it, but it would never obstruct it on a partisan basis.

In that same article I continued by proposing an age limit. We do now have an age limit in the Senate, and I think that this was long overdue. But, there are some aspects of the present regulations which, in my opinion need modification. I believe there should be an age limit for senators after which they retire on pension—and this is now in effect—or, if they die before that time, their widows should receive the pension. I think the widows are very poorly served in the present circumstances because it must be remembered that many senators—in fact, the great majority of them—gave up, either in whole or in part, earnings far in excess of the \$10,000 that they were getting at that time, and the \$15,000 that they are getting now, when they entered the Senate. Because of the average session of six to seven months then, and the average session of ten to eleven months now, they are not free to continue their regular employment or business, and they accepted the life appointment knowing that they were protected for as long as they lived.

I went on to say that the age limit should be 75 years, and that has come about. There are many senators who do not need that kind of protection, but we must have some arrangement that makes it impossible for this place to become a haven for none but the rich. It should be open to people of competence, regardless of their financial status.