

member of the Senate does with much interest to the speech of the hon. member from Middlesex. He is always interesting, always eloquent, and he has the happy faculty of always clothing his ideas in the graceful and beautiful English of which he is a complete master. I am sure we all listened with a great deal of interest to his eloquence. On this occasion, while he was no more eloquent than on other occasions, he was certainly more interesting in some respects, and especially from the novelty of the views that he took the opportunity of expressing. Early in his remarks he spoke about the position which the Senate occupies in the legislation of this country. He spoke of this House as being a non-partisan body. I should be very glad to think it is. The Senate is suppose to copy to a large extent its rules and procedure from the House of Lords. How can it be possible that the Senate can be non-partisan, when we have here a gentleman who speaks of holding the position of leader of the Opposition—leader of the Opposition in a non-partisan body! The thing is utterly and absolutely absurd. Has anyone ever heard of any member of the House of Lords being addressed and spoken of as the leader of the Opposition? Opposition to whom? Opposition to the Government of the day. It cannot be anything else, yet here is this hon. gentleman surrounded by his friends of the same political party, acting as an opposition to the Government of the day and still assuming and claiming that this is a non-partisan body. I never heard of a more absurd statement, or a more absurd condition of things. It is a condition of things, which appears to me must be changed sooner or later if the Government of this country is to go on as it is. If the hon. gentleman from Middlesex, and those who think with him, are in this Chamber for the purpose of opposing the Bills and actions of the Government of the day, how is it possible for the country to be carried on as long as there is that majority of the Senate, which is opposed to the present Administration? I cannot see how it can be done. The thing is perfectly anomalous, and it appears to me that if hon. gentlemen opposite intend to carry out that view, it is utterly impossible for the Government of the country to go on as it ought to go on, so that those who come into the House of Commons, who receive the majority of the votes of the people of this country, and receive the support of the majority of the members of the House of Commons, should be able to carry on the

government of this country in such a way as they have a right to carry it on, and as they were sent here by the majority of the people to carry it on. I quite agree with the remarks which the hon. gentleman made with regard to the independence of this body. I think it should be independent. I go further than the hon. gentleman. He thinks it should be independent of the Government. I think it should be independent of the Government, and of the Opposition as well. It should be independent of all parties, and unless it is independent of all parties it cannot be considered an independent body.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—It is now independent of the country.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex)—I do not know about that.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—I think that is a thing we should not allow to be remedied from the outside. I think we should have sufficient interest in the public affairs of this country to remedy that from the inside. When I was a member of the House of Commons, and matters regarding the Senate came up, I always took the stand in support of this honourable body. In the remarks that I made I even supported the mode of selecting the members, who are appointed to this body. In thinking over the subject, in thinking over the mode, and inquiring into the methods by which members were appointed to the Senate in the United States and other places, I found that really they had more trouble often in the election of their members there than they could very well overcome. I found there were deadlocks—deadlocks even for years—so that a particular State was deprived for quite a while of the services of any gentlemen representing that State in the Senate of the United States. I should like to see this body, as we should all wish to see it, a body absolutely independent of one party or the other. I think the intention, when the Senate was originally constituted, was that when gentlemen were appointed to this body they should throw aside their party affiliations, just as much and in the same degree as the judge is supposed to throw aside his party affiliations when he is appointed to a seat on the bench. The only reason why an independent body like this should be appointed and constitute one-half the Parliament of Canada, can only be on some such idea as that. This is the view and the idea that ought to prevail.