

had no Minister holding a portfolio in this Chamber. It is to be regretted. I do not say it from a party standpoint, or do not wish to make an attack on the Government, but certainly we cannot divest ourselves of the feeling that, owing to the fact that we have no Ministers holding portfolios in this House, our prestige before the country and before the representatives of the people has fallen very much lower than it would otherwise be. There is no question about that, and I fully agree also with what has fallen from the hon. gentleman from Victoria, that it is not fair that the responsibility of carrying through all the legislation of this Chamber should be placed on the shoulders of our worthy, our very eminent and talented leader. I think it is altogether unjust and unfair to him that all the responsibilities of a Cabinet Minister should be placed on him without any of the emoluments attached to a portfolio. I am pleased with the spirit of independence manifested by my hon. colleague from Victoria. He has suggested another plan by which this difficulty can be remedied, and the Senate brought into a higher position in the estimation of the country—that is, if we exercise a little more independence and throw out a few more of the objectionable Bills that come before us. I venture to say that the rejection last year of a certain Bill for an expenditure that the Government proposed to make of some of four or five millions of dollars in the Lower Provinces has done more to pacify public agitation against this Senate than anything that has taken place for a long time; and if a few more incidents of that kind were recorded, we would certainly raise ourselves to a higher plane than we occupy at the present time in the estimation of the people. I am perfectly satisfied that any gentleman who travels throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion must come to the conclusion that the constitution of the Senate should be changed and brought more into touch with the great moving forces of this country.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—There has been a good deal said here about the Senate not being in accord with the people. I differ very much from those hon. gentlemen altogether. The Senate is a good deal what we ourselves make of it. My hon. friend

from Ottawa spoke twice, in the remarks that he made, about the Senate not being in touch with the people. My experience has been quite the reverse; I believe that the Senate is as much in touch with the people as the House of Commons is. It is true that we have no Ministers holding portfolios in this House. It is very desirable that we should have them. I was in the House of Commons for over nineteen years and I know something about it. My hon. friend from Ottawa refers to the fact that the present Government in Ontario has now been in power for 20 years. I remember the time when they came into power. I was in the Local Legislature at that time and held a seat in the Commons as well. But when the hon. gentleman endeavors to create the impression that in the Province of Ontario to-day the majority of the electors are opposed to the Government of the Dominion, I think he is very much mistaken. I introduced a Bill in this House last year, in which the people of this country are much interested. The Bill was passed through this Chamber by a unanimous vote, it went over to the Railway Committee of the House and was defeated there. I introduced it in the Senate again this year. I had to fight the railways. There are three or four railway directors in this House, and a railway solicitor, but they voted it through here this year by 14 of a majority, I think. It went over to the other House and it was again killed there, and it is said that railway passes had something to do with it. Why? I may say that almost every hon. gentleman in this House has a railway pass in his pocket, this hon. gentleman with the rest; but it did not influence us in our legislation. In this case we were in touch with the people. When my hon. friend here moved this resolution, did it occur to him how other countries that he has referred to are governed? Are they governed any better anywhere than we are in this colony of Great Britain? Are the people of these countries more free, prosperous or happy than we are here? I remember the time when the upper House in the old Province of Canada was elective, and I remember the condition of affairs at that time, but we will not go back that far. When my hon. friend tells us that we are appointed by the Crown and that therefore we have no influence, does he consider what appointment by