

would like to see the Senate represented in the Cabinet; but having studied the constitution of the Senate and the elements on which our force rests, I cannot find fault with the Government for giving us no part in the executive. Where do we get our authority here? Are we in touch with the people? I fail to see it. We are appointed by the Crown and the Crown is practically anything but an executive power. Of course it was once at the time of the conquest and before Magna Charta, but in modern times and especially since 1832 the power comes from the people and, I say again, we are not in touch with the people. Not later than 1872 Lord Beaconsfield, then Disraeli, speaking at Manchester on a question similar to the one I have brought up here, the remodelling of the House of Lords, used these words: "How is that House to be reconstructed? Will it be appointed by the Crown? If so, what influence will it or can it have?" Hon. gentlemen, this is the whole question; we are appointed by the Crown and what influence can we have? I will not confine myself to my own views on this question; I prefer to deal with the history of the Senate itself, and to show, if I am young, I can bring forward the arguments of men that were reputed to be wise and who were old enough to give their words weight with this House and with the country generally. For this reason, without indulging in any theory of mine, I will simply review the history of the upper House, and hon. gentlemen will see that as long as it was intended that we should not have responsible government, it was reasonable and logical that the upper House should be appointed by the Crown. At the time that we had responsible government given us the leading men of the country, such as Lafontaine, Baldwin, Sir John Macdonald, Cartier, Cauchon and others, took a similar view to that which I am taking now. This may appear strange to some hon. gentlemen here. The first legislature dates from 1763. At the time we had no responsible government: the Imperial Government appointed a Council to govern the country along with the Governor General. It was quite logical and right. The second Council was granted by the Quebec Act in 1774. Again we had a Legislative Council appointed by the Crown, which was logical, because the people had nothing to do with the shaping

of their own destinies. The third upper House was given us in 1790, at the time of the separation of the two Canadas. At that time, also, a nominated Council was given, and the intention to imitate the British Parliament went so far that the Lieutenant-Governors were allowed to create, with the sanction, of course, of the Imperial Government, hereditary Legislative Councillors. The object was to have an absolute image of the British Parliament. It was all right so long as responsible government was not given us. The next was in 1840, when, as hon. gentlemen are aware, on the report of Lord Durham, responsible constitutional government was given us: But although the liberal Government of England then did give us a constitution which appeared to grant us responsible government, such was not the opinion of Lord Sydenham, for example, who was appointed the first Governor in Canada after that constitution. It was only after a severe contest that Lord Sydenham consented to actual responsible government in Canada. By the constitution of 1840 the Council then was to be appointed by the Crown, and it was not distinctly decided that we were to have responsible government. So far, I can find no fault with the nomination of members of the upper Chamber, because it was in keeping with the authority that was meant to prevail at the time. When the authority comes from the King, then the nominees of the King can legislate. But after the despatch of Lord Russell, when the views of Baldwin had preponderated, and we were at last given actual responsible government, what happened? Those who are the fathers of our political liberties here would not be satisfied with a nominated Council, but in 1856 they succeeded in having the Senate, which was then composed, as it is now, by nominees of the Crown, replaced by an elective Council, and I will read you some of the reasons why that change was brought about. First, although the Council was then composed of many of the leading men of Canada, it was fast sinking in the estimation of the people, and losing influence. Such men as Sir E. P. Taché, Morin, Seymour, Belleau, Bolton, Leslie, de Boucherville, Walker, &c., could not preserve its prestige:

"It is admitted by all hands," said Sir John A. Macdonald, in the course of the debate, "that the