House is constituted as I propose. In England, on the contrary, the House of Lords, which dates from the Norman Conquest, is steadily going down, and the day is not distant when, probably, they will have to resort in England to some elective system. I say that the tendency of the age is in the direction of elective legislators; and that we are taking the opposite direction, and are going back to the middle ages.

My hon friend from British Columbia and my hon friend the senior member from Halifax, have advised a course by which we can show our importance. For my part I am adverse to that remedy. It is to render ourselves mischievous, by refusing to pass the Supply Bill. I do not believe in such a course; we should have a dignity and influence of our own without resorting to so mischievous an experiment.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—You would not get your pay if we rejected the Supply Bill.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—My. hon. friend from Halifax wants Ministers with portfolios in this House as a panacea.

Hon. Mr. POWER—My hon. friend is attributing language to me that I did not use. He did not remain in the Chamber during the debate, and probably has taken his report of my remarks at second hand.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—I did not catch what the hon. gentleman has said, but I from Rideau Division says that we should all resign at once. That is not my motion, but if it came to that I might be found as ready to resign as anybody else; but I do not think it is right to go beyond the terms of my resolution. The motion is similar to one proposed by Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier in 1855, and by Mr. Morin in the upper House—it is to change the nominative system into an elective one, by some way or other, and that those gentlemen who hold their seats under the nominative system should Continue to do so during their lifetime. That is my proposition. Out of four members nominated for life, in 1840, some twenty-one were still alive, at Confederation, and there was no such antagonism

evening. In the same way nominated Senators could act in harmony with Senators appointed by the local Legislatures. Much stress is laid on the proposition that the composition of the Senate is of a very superior character. With that I agree; but it goes to strengthen the position I have taken. If the Chamber, as a whole, composed of men individually equal to and superior to those of the other House, does not stand as high in the estimation of the people as the lower House, what is the reason of it? The reason cannot be but in the Constitution itself, and this is the gist of my proposition. Although this body is composed of selected men, our position here is inferior to that of the other House.

Some Hon. GENTLEMEN-No, no, no.

Hon. Mr. OGILVIE—The hon, gentleman's position may be; let him speak for himself and not for the House.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—I say that this House is practically a legislative body and nothing else. It does not control the executive as the other one does. There is no correlation between the two Houses. Executive is in the other House wholly, and I assert here to-night that the work we are doing in the shape of private Bill legislation, could be, perhaps, as well done by a committee of experienced or expert men appointed to look over private Bills, as it is by us. We are nothing but a legislative body, and, properly speaking, we do not share in the Executive labors of our country. Therefore I maintain the position I have taken, that although this House is composed of men of a superior class, we do not occupy as high a position in the estimation of the country, as the other House, and the fault that it is so, must be in the constitution.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—The logical result then is, that there must be no Senate.

continue to do so during their lifetime. Bers nominated for life, in 1840, some twenty-one were still alive, at Confederabetween them and the members who were elected, as was suggested here this