

is not the necessity that might perhaps at one time have existed for that protection in regard to what I have endeavoured to describe—the protection of capital, perhaps, as against labour, nor of the rich as against the poor, or of landed interests or proprietors as against casual newcomers who may be asking for some radical legislation to protect themselves or help them in some special and peculiar way. Thus the necessity for these things does not exist to-day with the House of Commons as at present constituted, and I believe that the people will take care, now, with the education that the masses have, to see that the House of Commons is constituted of gentlemen sufficiently educated and able to protect every interest that may be brought in question with regard to any legislation that is proposed. So much for that.

Now, let me say one word with regard to some of the suggestions that have been made other than by myself in sessions gone by. I listened to the discussion of this question, but I never took any part in it until last year. I have had the benefit of hon. gentlemen giving their own opinions, and I have endeavoured to form a correct opinion as to what was best in the interest of the country. Some people have suggested the appointment of senators by the provincial legislatures instead of as they are now appointed. It seems to me that can accomplish no good. That could not make things any better, but a great evil would exist that does not exist now. With the questions that are continually arising as to whether the province or the Dominion has authority to deal with certain matters these senators, appointed by the provinces, would feel it to be their duty to protect the provinces that appointed them, human nature being as it is. The provinces would be found clashing with the House of Commons when the House of Commons undertook to exercise its authority as a federal institution and their legislation would be annulled by a Senate coming from the provinces and which would therefore be provincial in regard to the source of their appointment, and it seems to me they would be guided by this in settling the question as to who they should protect. I never heard any strong argument in favour of appointment by the provincial legislatures. I never heard it suggested with any particularly good reason being given with it, and I never heard any hon. gentleman give any sound reason or his own opinion solidly and unequivocally in favour of such a change. I suggest that it would be an evil, for the reason I have stated, and it would not accomplish from a federal standpoint the object which its advocates have in view. We have the legislatures to deal with local matters, and from the federal standpoint the appointment of senators by the provin-

cial legislatures would result in interference with federal legislation, for the reasons which I have given, and it would bring about no good as far as I can see. While I am speaking about provincial legislatures, perhaps I might point out that the greater number of matters that are dealt with in the shape of legislation in Canada are dealt with by the provincial legislatures, and that what the provincial legislatures do comes home to the ordinary man in his every-day life and affects him more directly than any of the things that we do in this House, important as they may be. Yet, notwithstanding this, no provincial legislature has ever found it necessary to have a Senate to see that it does not go wrong. The provincial legislatures of the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec have no second Chamber, no cooling basins, to save them from the results of passing too radical legislation. Gentlemen are elected to these Houses who take care to look after provincial interests and to protect everybody on fair terms in all legislation that is brought forward. If it has been found that there is no need for any second Chamber where such a multitude of matters is dealt with of such great importance to the ordinary man every day of his life and which affect him to a much greater extent than do the things that are dealt with in the federal arena, it is another good reason why we require no second Chamber in federal matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They have a second chamber in Quebec and Nova Scotia.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend says that they have a second Chamber in Quebec and Nova Scotia. They had them in other provinces, but dropped them. That is the best answer to that. There was no earthquake, there was no army called out and there was no trouble in the country when they did drop them. It seemed that the people did not notice them. They had been so inactive that they were not noticed when they were dropped. Their dropping did not make any noise, it hurt nobody and things have gone along in these provinces ever since at least as well as if there were upper Chambers. I do think that the legislative councils in Nova Scotia and Quebec are not accomplishing very much or we would not have to be informed that they are actually in existence to-day. They are such nonentities that I had forgotten about them until I was reminded of the fact. At all events, the fact that the upper Chambers in the other provinces have fallen out of use without anyone noticing it is the very best argument that they were not much use when they existed. Two sessions ago there was a motion made by the present hon. deputy-speaker, in relation to the constitution of the Senate, and the Prime Minister, speak-