

organization of the Senate; the question was one which pressed itself on the attention of the House.

Mr. WALLACE (South Norfolk) said that some of the hon. members who had taken part in the debate had forgotten that we are part of a monarchy and have a Sovereign. It was calmly proposed by the resolution on the table to change the mode of constituting a body which was equal to this House, a power which the House did not possess. He had always believed that Senatorships were the rewards of merit, similar to the creation of Peerages in England. Peers were created for services rendered in the field or in Parliament. Sir HUGH SMITH and General NAPIER having been raised to the Upper House for military services, while HER MAJESTY offered a peerage to M. DISRAELI for his political services. Take away from the Crown the right to appoint to the Senate, and what means remained by which the Sovereign could recompense a Canadian subject for his service to his country. Titles were not in accordance with the genius or spirit of this people, and this right taken away nothing was left. It was incorrect to say that the representation of this country was based on population. It was based on property or income. There were no two constituencies having a population alike, and therefore that could not be the basis of representation. It was also a mistake to speak of the sovereignty of the Provinces of this Dominion. There was no such thing; all the powers the Provinces possessed were delegated to them. They legislated within limits fixed by the Imperial Parliament. The Senate had been spoken of as a safe-guard against the encroachments of the larger Provinces on the smaller. He did not understand how such encroachment was possible. No burden could be imposed on one that did not fall on the other. The only way this House could impose on them was by not giving them a proper share of the public expenditure, but that was a matter over which the Senate had no control. It would be a difficult matter to prevent conflicts from arising between the two Houses, but the House of Commons could at any time stop the supplies which they controlled. If the Senate were made elective, did any one suppose that the seventy or eighty members elected to that body would be better representatives of

the people than the 206 members of this House? Or did any one suppose that the 206 members of the House of Commons would submit to be controlled by the 80 Senators if the latter were elected by the people? He looked upon it that the Senators were not to represent public opinion, but were to exercise judicial powers. He held that Senators who held their position for life were more independent of the popular will than the Commons, and, therefore, more likely to give a calm and unbiassed judgment on questions affecting the public mind. Therefore, he thought it better that they should be nominated as they were now, and that they should be elected as representatives of the people. There would be little difference between elections by the Local Legislatures and elections by the people directly. The majority supporting the Government of the day would elect their candidates. He regarded this resolution as a sort of want-of-confidence motion. It implied a doubt as to whether the Ministry would do justice. It had been asserted that the Senate was a useless body in legislation. He denied that. He held that many members of the Senate would be ornaments to this House or any other legislative body. There were gentlemen there who had taken a prominent part in public affairs for years, and who had breathed political being into many members of this House who had been disparaging that honorable body. He did not think it was wise in this House to depreciate the other branch of the Legislature. But, it was said, they had retarded legislation. Well, this House was responsible for that, in losing time in long debates in the early part of the session and rushing Bills through without giving them proper consideration. Would that be an argument for doing away with this House? If the Upper Chamber had not given as much attention to these measures as they ought to have done, it was the fault of this House. But hon. members should remember that measures were debated in this House before they were sent to the Senate, and they did not, therefore, require to be so thoroughly discussed in the Upper Chamber. He was opposed to the resolution, because he felt, if this right of appointing to the Senate were taken away from the Crown, there was but one link remaining connecting this colony with the Sovereign, and