

debate we are now proceeding with is simply whether we shall adopt the American system of electing Senators or not. I do not see how that debate can take any time, even if every gentleman in the House should express his opinion whether Senators should be elected by the provinces or be appointed by the Crown, as they are now. I would call hon. gentlemen's attention to the fact that we have the North-West Constitutional Bill before us for to-morrow, and we have the Bills of Exchange and Notes Bill for to-morrow, then we have the Criminal Law Amendment Bill for to-morrow or next day, which will require, no doubt, a great deal of discussion, and we will have several others which I do not remember at this moment. I dare say the Speaker has now before him Bills from the other House which we shall have to deal with, and we all know what is the usual consequence of a debate of this kind being prolonged from day to day and adjourned. We had one last year which should have been finished in a day, and it took us a week. I see no reason why this debate will not last a week if hon. gentlemen should discuss the constitution in all its bearings as some are likely to do. We allow a large latitude in debate in this House, and I should be the last man to restrict it, and for these reasons it would be better for us to go on and finish the discussion now. It is practically a narrow question, although an important one, which we can finish within some reasonable time and then we shall have the consciousness of keeping our work before us and not delaying it by these discussions.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I think it is to be regretted that this spirit of industry which now animates the leader of the House did not animate him at the time that the long adjournments were proposed.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Since the hon. gentleman begins in that tone, I must remind him that when these long adjournments took place there were not before the House several of the most important Bills of the Session, as we have now, and the hon. gentleman should spare us his sarcasm.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—That is true, but I think the question has for some time occupied the attention of the gentleman

who moved the resolution this evening, and I will proceed to offer him my congratulations on the great industry he has displayed in getting up this case. It may be said that all these details about Legislative Councils and Senates and Houses of Lords, in Europe and elsewhere, which he has detailed may be found in any good almanac, but for all that, it takes a vast deal of labor to gather up these details and to place them before a listening assemblage in order and with a useful object. Therefore, I am quite ready to offer the hon. gentleman my congratulations on the industry he has displayed in getting up this case, although I cannot agree thoroughly in all his arguments and all his propositions.

Of course the great object of those on whom the duty devolves of framing a constitution is to have the best and strongest Legislatures which wisdom can devise. In that way, of course, an upper Chamber is essential as a sort of balance wheel in a free constitution of this sort. I do not think there can be much difference of opinion as to the necessity of a second Chamber. We recognize that necessity every Session and almost every working day of the Session in the work that we do in the Senate of Canada, but no doubt, as has been said by some speakers—especially by my hon. friend from Ottawa—there is a feeling that a change in the character of the Senate is desirable and it is a happy feature in the case that a considerable number (I will not say a majority because we have had no vote on it yet) of the members of this House see the coming change in that light. They think in the future that vacancies in the Senate, as they occur, will be filled up, not by nomination but by election. A great deal has been said in the course of this debate, both by the hon. gentleman who introduced the question and others, in favor of the Senate of the United States, where the elective principle is in full blast. Not only in this House, but in many of the public meetings in England on different occasions where a number of leading statesmen of the day assemble and express their opinions, you find them speaking in terms of high encomium of the capacity and usefulness of the United States Senate. I am not disposed to concur in those views, for reasons which I will briefly state to the House. I think that a country that is smarting, as Canada