

ber so constructed as to prevent the larger constituted body from acting according to public opinion. The suggestion to elect the senators seems to be nothing but an excuse for the retention of that Chamber.

The argument was advanced last year that they were necessary to protect the minority. I ask when did they protect the minorities. I have never heard of their doing anything to protect the minorities in this country. We have heard discussions during the last 30 years, if not during the whole 40 years since confederation, about the rights of minorities being interfered with, but we have never heard of any occasion when the Senate went into the arena of politics or public life in any sense to protect the minorities. Some gentleman has said that they might be needed at some time because the smaller provinces, having a smaller number of members in this House, would not get justice as between different localities in Canada, and that the Senate might force the House of Commons to give these smaller provinces some greater rights. But the smaller province has also a smaller number of senators and, human nature being as it is, and the number of representatives of the smaller, the majority in the Senate would favour the same legislation as the House of Commons, and therefore the grievance would not be remedied.

Thus, it seems to me to be about almost idle to-day to ask for the retention of this body on the ground that the Senate will protect minorities. Minorities have called out for protection from time to time during the last 40 years, but I do not remember that the Senate itself ever interfered to protect any minority, nor do I think that they could or would do so for the reasons I have expressed. If the home government can, as I have pointed out, interfere in any large matter under our construction, in the case for instance of a small province being unjustly treated, surely His Majesty's government, a council composed of representatives of the Lords and of the Commons, would afford as effective a safeguard as any Senate that could be formed in Canada. So again, I am obliged to say that the Senate is unnecessary.

I wish to place on 'Hansard' a few newspaper quotations. Last year I placed upon 'Hansard' a quotation from the Toronto 'Star' of 1909. I shall again read a portion of it because I intend to make another quotation from that paper and the two are better read together. Shortly before I made my motion last year the Toronto 'Star' on February 4, said:

As the matter now stands the Senate is simply an addition to the patronage of the government. Patronage in the civil service we have learned to endure through custom, but surely it is unwise to extend the system

of patronage to the appointment of those who make the laws of the land. Responsible government means the responsibility of the government to parliament, but who can speak seriously of the responsibility of a government to a portion of parliament appointed by the government itself?

The plan laid before the Senate by the Hon. Sir R. W. Scott is good in so far as it proposes to substitute election for appointment. An elected Senate, dealing independently with the measures sent up by the House of Commons, including government measures, might occasionally serve a good purpose. It is doubtful whether such a body could work in harmony with a system which requires that the government of the day shall have a parliamentary majority for the support of its measures, but if it were found unworkable, it would probably be a half-way house on the road to abolition, which to many seems to be the logical solution of the problem.

Since this matter was debated last session, when it had the benefit of what was said pro and con with regard to this motion, that same newspaper wrote another article, dated November 16, 1909. That was written just after this parliament was opened by His Excellency and when notice of this motion was given on the order paper. The Toronto 'Star' then said:

Against the Senate we wish to register several objections. The least of these is that it is a feeble echo of the party in power in the Commons. When the Senate does nothing but ratify the will of the Commons, we see it at its best, for we are then having representative government. The will of the elected parliament is not being frustrated by another body, whose members are chosen for reasons the people know nothing about, and which no amount of study can enable them to understand. At such a time the Senate is only unnecessary, and nothing worse.

Yet we must qualify the statement, for in that case it is even worse than unnecessary and worse than being a profitless expense, because no member of parliament knows just how soon a vacancy in the Senate may occur, and it is not uncommon to find representatives of the people forfeiting their popularity at the polls confident of reaching that Upper Chamber where no poll is long enough to reach them.

At another time the Senate is not the feeble echo of the Commons. We submit that it is seen at its worst when it resists the will of the Commons, or undertakes to originate legislation. In that case it weakens popular government, impedes, and frustrates it. Why should the people support an appointed House to resist and baffle the purposes of an elected one?

Thus we have from that newspaper its confirmed opinion, since the debate of last session—a newspaper not agreeing with me in party politics, but having a large circulation in Toronto and throughout Ontario, and therefore some pretension to voice public opinion. We have