

the principles on which it was established has been urged as a reason why it should be abolished. In reply to this we cannot do better than quote the language of a well-known writer, whose sympathies are certainly strongly on the side of democracy :

"We are told that the belief in the need of a second chamber is a mere superstition. If it is, the superstition is very prevalent, for of the nations which since the beginning of this century have been framing for themselves Parliamentary Constitutions, Greece alone so far has failed to recognize the necessity of a second chamber. Japan, whose constitution has been framed in view of the fruits of general experience, has two chambers in her Imperial Diet, France it is true, during the agony of the revolution had only a single chamber ; but the precedent will hardly be thought auspicious, since never, even in the case of the maddest despot, has there been a more frightful display of the consequences of uncontrolled power."

In considering the question as to the necessity or advisability of a second chamber the analogy of the British House of Lords, certainly the most influential and the most august of all such bodies, naturally presents itself. We are told in reference to this that in this country no such body can exist—that the House of Lords is a remnant of antiquated feudalism, and is but the representative of a privileged class which has no counterpart, and can have no counterpart in this country.

It is not true, certainly it is not the whole truth, to contend that the British House of Lords, the Imperial Second Chamber, the model upon which it was intended, as far as circumstances would permit, to establish the Canadian Senate, is merely the representative of a particular class of the community. The House of Lords does represent a very large and very important part of the body politic, but the importance of its position is due to the fact that it does very efficiently, and ably discharge the important function of revising the general body of legislation, of dealing with it from a position not affected by temporary influences, of giving time for further consideration, and of bringing to bear upon public questions the opinions of a body of men, many of whom are of the ripest experience, the greatest intelligence, and most cultivated thought.

It is perfectly true that in this country we cannot have a body of men of the standing of the House of Lords, possessing in the same eminent degree either its strength, or its weakness, but we