

of the Senate, in saying that if his election rested with the Senate of that day, so high was our regard for Mr. Allan, that his election would have been unanimous. Mr. Christie was another elected member who occupied the chair after confederation. Mr. McMaster, head of the Bank of Commerce, and many other distinguished men were elected. No finer man ever sat in parliament than Sir Alexander Campbell. He was liked by both sides of the House. He was reasonable and fair on all occasions; he was an elected member. Mr. Vidal was one of the most recent in that class, and hon. gentlemen know the character he held among us. He was loved and respected by all. So it was in the province of Quebec. You had Sir Narcisse Belleau, Sir Letelier de St. Just, who was my colleague at one time, Thomas Ryan who was vice-president of the Bank of Montreal, and chairman of the Board of Trade, Montreal, Mr. Sanborn, afterwards a judge—all elected members. I could go over a long list of men who were distinguished in this Chamber, and who were selected by the people as their representatives. It cannot, therefore, be urged that the elective system which prevailed before confederation was in any sense a failure. In the change which I propose, by compulsory voting the cost of election will be largely reduced. Any man who has a right to vote should exercise his franchise on an occasion of that kind, when the destinies of the country are in the balance. He should express his view as to the best men to represent Canada and cast his vote. If he disapproves of all the candidates he has only to attend and put in a blank ballot; he is not compelled to vote. But certainly any man who gets the franchise and has the protection of the law of his country ought to take at least that small part in the administration of public affairs, to say who, in his opinion, is the most honourable and suitable man to represent the people in the parliament of Canada. Then a question naturally arises, why was it at confederation this change was made? The people were not consulted, as you all know. There were many large questions coming up at the conferences held at Charlottetown, Quebec and London. The smaller questions, and that was one of them in the minds of

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

many, had to give way. Still, the representatives of the Liberal party did not yield their opinion. The Hon. William McDougall and Sir Oliver Mowat, both representative men at the Charlottetown conference and the Quebec conference, advocated the elective principle. George Brown, strange to say, although all his life advocating this question of representation by population and giving the people the broadest power, by some inexplicable change of his mind took the other view for the moment, but the people had no opportunity of discussing it. If the question were raised again in Canada as to the proper way of constituting this Chamber, it would be in favour of election by the people. The people are exceedingly jealous of their rights, and they would insist upon exercising their power. I have suggested what I consider a fair proportion of the elected and appointed. I had some difficulty in making up my mind as to what was the best proportion. I have drawn up a variety of proposals, and I find that the proportion fixed in the resolutions seems best. When the four provinces to the west of the lakes obtain their complement, it will bring the representation of this House up to 96—24 from the maritime provinces, 24 from Ontario, 24 from Quebec and 24 from the west. That will give 32 appointed to 64 elected, and that I thought was a fair proportion. It would give what I think is necessary to the government of the day, a reasonable following in the Chamber. The views of the House of Peers coincide with my own; you must have, under our system, a majority supporting the government in one House which the people have exclusive control over, and the policy of that House must not in any way be thwarted in the upper House. The true line to take in the upper House is to criticise, amend and modify, to correct the errors and hasty legislation of the other Chamber, and not to set itself up and advocate something different, and not to throw out Bills affecting the policy of this country which the House of Commons had the right to inaugurate. On that principle, I conceive, in order to give the government of the day, whether Conservative or Liberal, some reasonable following in this Chamber, that one-third of the nominations should rest with the government.