

Hon. George Lynch-Staunton, of Hamilton, Ontario, introduced by Hon. Sir James Lougheed and Hon. Mr. Milne.

Hon. Adam B. Crosby, of Halifax, Nova Scotia, introduced by Hon. Sir James Lougheed and Hon. Mr. Dennis.

Hon. Charles E. Tanner, of Pictou, Nova Scotia, introduced by Hon. Sir James Lougheed and Hon. Mr. McLennan.

EXTENSION OF PARLIAMENTARY TERM.

MOTION.

Hon. H.-J. CLORAN rose to move:

That an Order of the Senate do issue for a copy of the correspondence, which has passed, between the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Hon. Sir Robert L. Borden, and the leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition of Canada, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, regarding the war extension of time of the life of the present Parliament, be brought down and laid on the Table of the Senate for the information and consideration of the honourable members of this House.

He said: The object I had in view in giving notice of this matter on the opening day of the session and bringing it before the House, has been attained, not in full measure, but in very fair measure, of which you have the proof in the introduction of five new senators, with two more to come. My object was to call public attention without delay to the abnormal condition of things that existed regarding the representation in this honourable House. To attain that object, I had to ask for the production of the official correspondence between the Prime Minister of Canada and the leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition in the House of Commons which dealt exclusively with this question of representation.

In my opinion the Prime Minister acted wisely in consulting the leader of the Opposition in regard to the parliamentary representation during war time. The Prime Minister requested that all vacancies occurring in the House of Commons during war time should be filled by representatives of the same political faith as that of those who had resigned or died during the existing term of Parliament. That was a fair proposition. The proposition was entertained by the leader of the Opposition; but it went only half way. He was prepared to allow any vacancy caused by death to be refilled by a Conservative or a Liberal, according to the political faith of his predecessor. I may say that neither the Prime Minister nor the leader of the Opposition made any provision for the death or the resignation of Nationalists.

They were left on one side. That is a very strange thing; and I simply call the attention of this honourable House to the fact.

Pourparlers went on, as demonstrated in the correspondence, between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, with this result, that the latter was prepared to stand by an agreement whereby vacancies caused by death should be refilled by representatives of the same political faith as those who had previously occupied the seats. He would not consent to have members elected to vacancies caused by resignations. That was a most fair proposition. Vacancies caused by resignations are not in the same class as those caused by death. Vacancies may be caused by resignations for political purposes, and the leader of the Opposition was perfectly justified in resisting the demand of the Prime Minister that such vacancies should be filled by Conservatives.

Now, what has happened since then? The membership of this honourable House has been depleted very largely during the period of this war. Even to-day one of our trustiest and best workers has gone to his heavenly reward, the honourable senator from Prince Albert, Tom Davis. So we go, and so we come. It is hard to get here, but ah, it is so easy to go. What provision has either the leader of the Government or the leader of the Opposition in the Lower House made—and I blame them not—regarding representation in this honourable House? They have made absolutely none; and to-day seats in this honourable House that were held by Conservatives are refilled by Conservatives and seats that were held by Liberals are refilled by Conservatives. Is that a fair attitude for the Government to assume in this time of war? Why protect a representative in the House of Commons and refuse similar protection in the Upper House, called the Senate of Canada? Is it fair or just? I appeal to my honourable friends on the other side: is it fair under the circumstances and during a time like this, that the same rule should not apply to representatives in the Upper House as is applied by joint consent in the Lower House? There is the position involved in the correspondence for which I am asking, between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition.

Now, hon. gentlemen, until I called attention to the matter last Thursday, the opening day of Parliament, no steps had been taken to fill the vacancies in this honourable House. Seats are unoccupied not only on account of death, but many