

House of Commons, would necessarily give us men of a superior stamp. I do not think that the objection taken to that system by the hon. gentleman from Shediac is a very substantial one. I know it was mentioned during the Confederation debates, but I do not think that there was a great deal in it, that the labor of canvassing a large district was too great to be undertaken by a man of mature years. I believe that the size of the constituency would render it impracticable for a man to make a personal canvass of a district. He would not be expected to do it; and for that reason, as well as for the other reasons that I have already indicated, the candidate to be successful, should be a man well known and respected throughout the whole district. There is no doubt that the result was satisfactory. We got good men, and I have never heard that there was any complaint whatever, as to the manner in which the elected House of old Canada did its work. A House elected in that way, would be more independent than the present House; because those Senators would feel that they had their mandate from the people as directly as the members of the other House, and they would be in a position to speak out their minds just as boldly and as freely as the members of the House of Commons. I think too, that while they might be pretty good party men, their partizanship would be practically of broader character than that found in the House of Commons, or even in the Senate as it now exists. The smaller the constituency the more bitter the fight as a rule. The late Joseph Howe, who was a very shrewd man, as well as a distinguished politician, used to say, "the smaller the pit the more fiercely the rats fight." I think there is a great deal in it—the wider the constituency, the greater the tendency to broaden a man's view of politics. A House elected that way would necessarily be respected by the people at large, and the people would take more interest in those gentlemen whom they had themselves voted for and elected than they would take in men appointed in any other way. There is no doubt that the people who vote for a man like to watch his career. They take more interest in his sayings and doings than in the sayings and doings of a man in whose appointment they have had no say. There is another point which occurs to me in connection with this plan,

and I would suggest it to the hon. gentleman from Shediac, who spoke of the respect felt in the United States for the Senate there. I am satisfied that if the United States Senators of the present day, instead of being elected by the local legislatures, were elected by the people of each State, they would be much more highly respected and would be a much higher class of men than they are. Of course one cannot, in the course of a discussion like this, go into the details of a plan. This amendment has been suggested to the plan that was in operation in Canada before Confederation, that each Province should be divided into a certain number of districts—say the province of Quebec into 3 or 4 districts, each returning a certain number of members to the Upper House and electing them under a system of minority representation. In that way you would get a representation of the minority of each of these large districts. However, it is possible that the system which was in force in Canada before Confederation, would on the whole, work as well as any modification of it that we can think of just now. So much about the proposed change in the constitution. I think it is possibly desirable that there should be a change in the present system; and, as far as my impressions go at present, the change should be in the direction indicated—that is that we should go back to the system which prevailed in Canada before Confederation. We have not had anything from any member of the Government or from anyone entitled to speak on their behalf on this question; and unless the Government take the matter seriously in hand, it is not probable that any change will be made at an early date; and under the present system we can do a good deal to improve our position before the public. For instance, I think we might, at very small expense, provide some means for making our proceedings better known to the public than they are at present; and I think we could also, as has been indicated already, be a little more independent than we are. It is strange to see that there is more independence amongst the few members of the Opposition, who are here, than there is amongst the Government supporters. What I mean is this: that the members of the opposition are more likely to take a course different from the course of their party friends in the House of Commons,