

guished member of this House, very clearly says:—

The Senate should be in a position to check hasty legislation and mere popular clamour, and give time to allow some public opinion to assert itself. We are not a mere recording body to register the Acts of the popular branch.

These are some opinions which have been expressed by the founders of Confederation, and for which we should have some regard.

The Senate must be reformed. I think that is a very important question. In order to bring the Senate into harmony with the other branch, something must be done to reform the Senate. Here is what Mr. Borden said on that point; you remember he made a speech last year on the same subject to which I called the attention of the House, when I was criticising the situation. Here is what he said the other day:—

If friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, appointed during their tenure of office and before the will of the people was declared at the last election, are disposed to force upon us—

Force upon whom?—another branch of the legislature that has no more original jurisdiction than we have—

—the question of the constitution of the Senate and the nature of appointments thereto—well, speaking for myself, and I think speaking for the great majority of the people of this country—

And I think he is not speaking for anybody else—

—we are ready to accept that issue.

Well, so are we. We are in the hands of the people just the same as he is. If he wants the constitution of the Senate changed, I suppose he could take steps to do it.

Another gentleman who is a member of Parliament, also objected to the constitution of the Senate. Hon. Mr. White, Minister of Finance, said:

I say that the constitution of the Senate is not in keeping with the principles of British representative government—

That is a profoundly absurd statement—

And the time will come, if we are to have action such as this on the part of that body—

That is, with regard to the Naval Bill—

—that their constitution must be changed and brought into accord with the principles of constitutional government in the Empire.

It reminds me of Canute moving his chair to the seaside, and saying to the tide, 'You cannot pass Canute's chair.' Here comes this personage, sitting in his chair in the House of Commons, and say-

ing that the constitution of the Senate must be changed; and he says that it is not in harmony with the principles of British representative government. Why the constitution of the Senate of Canada is the only constitution of any of the dominions beyond the seas that is in any degree in harmony with the British constitution. The constitution of Australia is elective; the constitution of South Africa is partly elective, and partly nominative. Our constitution is more in harmony with the British constitution than that of any dependency beyond the sea. Hon. Mr. White says that must be changed. Well, let it be changed, but let it be changed according to the constitution. How is that to be done? Can the House of Commons do it? They can no more lay hands on the constitution of this House, than we can lay our hands on the constitution of the House of Commons. They have no authority to do it; no authority under the British North America Act to do it. Any amount of ranting on the stage, any amount of denouncing, any amount of clamour on the part of partisanship, does not affect the situation one particle no more than the ominous 'Nevermore' of Poe's Raven could affect the political condition of Great Britain. If the constitution of the Senate has to be changed, it can only be changed with the consent of all the provinces.

Some hon. GENTLEMEN—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS—The British North America Act is a treaty between the provinces and this Dominion which was not then founded, but which was to be founded under that Act. Read what was said in the debates in the old legislative assembly on that point. Every man who was a leader of his party admitted it was a treaty. Sir John A. Macdonald, Hon. George Brown, D'Arcy McGee, Wm. McDougall; and in the conference which was held in London, Sir Leonard Tilley, and Sir Chas. Tupper; in fact, all the representatives believed it was a treaty that gave to us certain powers, at least that put the government of the country into the hands of two trustees. One trustee was to be the House of Commons; the other trustee was the Senate. One trustee had not power to oust the other. The House of Commons cannot kick us out; we cannot kick out the House of Commons. No matter how richly it may deserve such treatment we have no power to do it. The only power that can change either of the constituents, is the power that