

us the advantage of a second Chamber. From the dawn of constitutional government in England there has been a House of Lords and a House of Commons, and when the United States came to form its constitution it created a second Chamber. We hear arguments advanced in favour of amending the system of appointing United States senators but we hear little or no argument in favour of the abolition of that Chamber. France has a second Chamber, Germany has a second Chamber, Japan has a second Chamber, all great civilized countries have second Chambers, and in view of the experience of history it would not be wise for us to recklessly do away with a Senate in Canada even though that body does not fulfil our expectations of what a second Chamber should be. It should rather be our aim to endeavour to devise some means to bring the Canadian Senate into harmony with the spirit of the age and the requirements of the country. We acknowledge our weakness when we say that we cannot accomplish any reform of the Senate. If we give our attention to the task, if this government gives attention to the task as it promised to do, I have no doubt that we can easily bring about reform. Before the Liberals attained power they pledged themselves to reform the Senate and the people believing that they were honest and truthful men, and men of resource returned them to power on that platform, but since the day they assumed the reins of government they have made absolutely no effort to carry out their pledges. There are two reasons, it seems to me, why the Canadian Senate has not come up to our expectations. In the first place the method of appointing senators is defective and I think a great improvement could be made in that direction. In the second place, the class of men who have been called to the Senate for many years past, since the present government came to power—and in this respect their predecessors sinned although not to the same extent—for many years past the men who have been called to the Senate are men who have been discarded by the people as unfit to sit in the House of Commons. That very fact is an evidence to my mind that they are not the best men to select for the Senate. I have always thought that those appointed to the Senate might be men from various walks of life selected for their fitness, their knowledge of affairs and their independence. If that rule were followed the Senate would be independent of the House of Commons and would be better equipped to fulfil the expectations of the people. There can surely be some means devised either of electing or appointing senators which would cause that body to be more beneficial to the country than it is to-day. I

am in favour of having a Senate, but I am also in favour of having it reformed. At all events surely it is high time that the government should make some attempt to carry out its pledges. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has referred to the fact that the province of Ontario has no second Chamber, but in my judgment had there been a well constituted second Chamber in that province, the late Liberal government there would never have dared to perpetrate the things they did. There would be a check upon them, their bad legislation would be rejected, and higher councils might have had a beneficial effect on their policy. The province of Quebec has a second Chamber and whether it is doing good or not I leave it to those who are best informed to say. No doubt, in the smaller provinces which are something like our county councils there is not that urgent need for a second Chamber that there is in a country like Canada and in countries like the confederation of states in South Africa and Australasia. In my judgment the proper thing is to follow the system adopted in the mother of parliaments and to have two Chambers, the one to be a check upon the other. I believe that if we reform the Canadian Senate and adopt some better means for the selecting of its members, the country will not complain of the expenditure of that body.

House divided on the motion (Mr. Lancaster).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Best,	McCarthy,
Campbell,	Magrath,
Chisholm (Huron),	Meighen,
Crothers,	Miller,
Currie (Simcoe)	Russell,
Emmerson,	Sexsmith,
Fraser,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Taylor (New
Kidd,	Westminster),
Lancaster,	Thornton,
Lewis,	Wallace.—22.
McCall,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McGiverin,
Armstrong,	McIntyre,
Aylesworth,	McKenzie,
Barker,	McLean (Huron),
Black,	Major,
Blain,	Marcile (Bagot),
Blondin,	Martin (Wellington),
Borden (Halifax),	Mayrand,
Boyce,	Meigs,
Bradbury,	Nantel,
Broder,	Nesbitt,
Brown,	Neely,
Carvell,	Northrup,
Cash,	Oliver,
Champagne,	Owen,