

length. I do not propose to offer the opinions of Lord Roseberry or any other member of that body as proper to lead the opinions of this House, though Lord Roseberry is a distinguished peer and has served the Crown with some success, but I find that that noble lord referred also to the opinions of many others in the course of his address, and in that way I think he is entitled to considerable attention. He said, for instance, that Cromwell abolished the House of Lords. Lord Salisbury, interposing, said: "And the House of Commons too." Lord Roseberry resuming said: "But he found it necessary to restore the House of Commons and, as a consequence, he also found it necessary to restore the House of Lords." Then his Lordship went on to tell what Cromwell himself had said on the subject, and as coming from a man of his great sagacity and experience, one who was not an aristocrat by party or profession, I think his words are worthy of attention. These are Cromwell's words in the quaint old style which he used—it is said that they are the last words that he addressed to Parliament: "I did tell you that I would not undertake such a Government as this unless there might be some other persons that might interpose between me and the House of Commons who had the power to prevent tumultuary and popular spirits." Cromwell was well aware of the difficulty of governing a democracy, and as one of the remedies for those occasions when democracy sometimes takes the bit in its teeth and runs riot, he thought that an upper House assisting him with its advice and experience was a kind of safety valve which he was not inclined to ignore or despise. I attach a good deal of importance to this expression of opinion coming from him. We know in ordinary times when things run smoothly along, when times are prosperous, men well employed, merchants making money and all classes of the community feeling that they are doing well, there is generally peace and harmony throughout the country. That is generally the case, not always perhaps; but there are other occasions (France knows them well) during which democracy considering itself perhaps deceived or offended, becomes suspicious and after that rebellious, and soon it gets into such a state that it cannot be withheld. France has seen such occasions as

that considerably more than once in its history, and the upshot of such a state of things has been pretty much always the same. It ends in military despotism: that is the way it ended in the days of the first Napoleon and again in the days of the second Napoleon, and it very nearly came to a similar conclusion not long ago, only the heart of the representative of the Bourbons failed him, and he could not submit to respect the familiar symbols of the republic. Had he had the courage and ability of the great Napoleon, the probability is he would have been seated on the throne of his ancestors. This is one of the dangers of democracy, and we know in France various attempts have been made to erect an upper Chamber. I really could not pretend to guess—because it would be a guess with me, for I have not looked it up—how many differently constituted upper Chambers they have had in France since the days of the first revolution, and it does not appear that any of them have given entire satisfaction. I suppose, the existing upper Chamber of France is about as solid, and it has about as respectable a place in the public estimation, as any Chamber which has preceded it. I, myself, recollect that in the days of Louis Phillippe they had a Chamber of Peers, and if my memory serves me right they held their meetings in the Palace of St. Cloud, but that Chamber saw the end of his régime and had to give place to one of a more popular nature. All these it is true were for the most part nominated and partially elected. The hon. gentleman who introduced this question was for submitting the election of future members of this Senate to the Local Legislatures. Now, I venture to differ from my hon. friend as to the expediency of that course. He has evidently copied it from the Senate in the United States, and I think I have shown that that body is not always to be trusted in cases of sudden emergency. But my objection to the appointment of Senators by the Local Legislatures is: First that it is required in the Senate that it should be a body differing somewhat in its character from the Commons; but if you give the nomination of Senators to the Local Legislatures you simply reproduce the House of Commons here. That is a thing which I think we do not want. The House of Commons has its part in the constitution, and the Senate ought to have its part, and they ought to be per-