

There are about 23,000 people in the North-West Provinces, or there were that number when the last census were taken. That number does not entitle them to the representation which the hon. gentleman proposes to give them in the Senate, on a numerical basis at all events. The Province of Prince Edward Island with its 100,000 souls has three or it may be four, I forget which.

Mr. DAVIES. Four.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Our own Province, with a population of about two millions, has a representation of but twenty-four; and although there may be a fair reason for granting to the various groups throughout this country a somewhat larger representation than the numerical one, still I do not think that, looking at what is done in the Senate, which I notice is adjourned for a fortnight at this very moment, from having nothing to do, there is no very burning necessity for having more than one representative from the North-West Territories. There is another point to which the hon. gentleman alluded, in regard to which I beg to take exception. The hon. gentleman travelled all over Ontario, and he said he did not find a single man, Conservative or Reformer, who had any objection to make to the Senate, or who thought that the Senate was a body of partisans appointed by the Government of the day. I travelled all over Ontario and visited a great number of places, and I venture to say this, that if the elections in the various counties had been conducted on an honest voters' list, on a voters' list made by the people and not by partisans of the Government, the hon. gentleman would not occupy his present seat to-day. But whether this be the case or not, I have this to say: In no one assembly out of the scores I addressed, attended largely both by Conservatives and Reformers, did I fail to call attention to the blot on our system of representative government, caused by the existence of a Senate, which was nominated exclusively by the Government of the day; and in no one of these places did I find any single question which seemed to take more hold of the popular mind, which seemed to commend itself more to the audiences (composed as they were of both Conservatives and Reformers), and if men of both political parties expressed themselves to me after the meeting more unreservedly on one question than another, it was as to the fact that the Senate, as now constituted, is a disgrace and a scandal in every respect to our system of government. It is not like the British House of Lords; there is no sort of comparison—it is not fit to be named in the same year, let alone on the same day. It is a perfectly useless, worthless body of partisans, and the sooner it is reformed the better for the people of the country, although it may not be better for the hon. gentleman and the party he controls.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to add a word to what has been said in regard to this matter. I apprehend that the leader of the Government does not make this addition to the Senate because he is fearful of being too weak in that revered body. I think the relative proportion of parties is about 15 to 63.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About two to one.

Mr. CHARLTON. The addition is not necessary, therefore, in the interest of his party? I rise, however, to corroborate what my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated. The First Minister could have hardly judged very accurately the condition of sentiment in the west if he supposes that the Senate of Canada is a popular body with the great mass of the people. I as well as the hon. gentleman travelled somewhat through Canada, and whatever sentiment might fail to receive the approval of the audiences, the one which was sure to meet with approbation was any reference in an unfavorable sense to the Canadian Senate. The Senate, Sir, is unquestionably unpopular with the people of Canada. The people of Canada recognise it as a useless appendage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

age to the Parliament of this country, a packed body of partisans—

Mr. McNEILL. I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether it is in order to speak of the second chamber of the legislature in those terms.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would say upon the question of order which the hon. gentleman has raised, that there can be nothing disorderly in speaking of the Senate as a packed body of partisans, unless the hon. gentleman thinks it is discreditable to be considered a partisan of the Conservative party. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the Conservative party is right in its views, that it is an honest, respectable party, why it is, of course, no discredit to the Senate to speak of it as a packed body of partisans of the Tory party.

Mr. McNEILL. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now whether two new members ought to be added to the Senate, and, of course, it is competent for hon. gentlemen to discuss the advisability of such a measure, and even to dispute the usefulness of that honorable body. As to the expressions used by the honorable member for Bothwell, I consider them rather objectionable, and I do not think such language ought to be used towards a legislative body which forms a part of our Parliament, and which, as such, ought to deserve the respect of this House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I accept your ruling. I have this to say in explanation—that I spoke of the Senate as a partisan body, because, Sir, it does not in any sense reflect the sentiments, or wishes, or feelings of the people of this country. The people in this country have no voice in the selection of its members; they are placed there by the nomination of the Crown; they are invariably men of one party. When a Reform member of the Senate dies his place is filled by a gentleman of the other party, and if the right hon. gentleman remains in power five or six years longer it is possible that you would not have five Reform members in that Chamber. If he should remain in power for ten years it would be a body which in all probability would be unanimously Tory—a body in which not a representative of one of the great political parties of this country could be found; and it was speaking in that sense that I referred to the Senate as a packed partisan body. I only had reference to the mode in which it was constituted. At the time the point of order was raised I was saying that if there is one unpopular feature of Canadian affairs, if there is one sentiment which appeals to public sympathy, in speaking to the people of this country, it is a denunciation of the mode of constituting the Senate, and the assertion that it is an unnecessary and a partisan body. With regard to the statement of the right hon. gentleman, that he comes here to this House with the approval of the people with regard to the constitution of the Senate and all the public questions that were raised in the election, and that therefore his policy with regard to the Senate is approved by the people, the answer to that statement is that we have not got an unbiassed, free, direct opinion from the people of this country. If the hon. gentleman had taken away either the Gerrymander Act, the Franchise Act, or the corrupt influences used by the Government, we would have come here with a majority; but, handicapped as we were with all these three influences and outrages, we have not got a free expression of the popular will. The hon. gentleman owes the majority at his back, not to an untrammelled expression of the popular sentiments of this country, but to the influences I have named—to loading the dice, to the arrangement of the constituencies in such a way as to enable two hundred and fifty thousand Conservatives in Ontario to exercise as much influence as would three hundred and fifty thousand Reformers, to the fixing of