

the constitution is not sufficient. If there is anything in the wide world we should be careful of it is not to tinker with our constitution. That we have a good constitution what more positive proof do we require than we have at the present time, and all that we require to allay any feeling that may exist against the Senate is that the Government should appoint two or three of the Ministers to this House. Really it was the only valid reason that cropped up in this debate that we should have a change at all. If we make the Senate elective, necessarily, the electors who send representatives here, will demand that they shall have some power. In the first place, if you make a property qualification, you will have these men coming here and saying: "We are the representatives of the property owners of this country." If a deadlock should come between the two Houses, without any good reason, very likely what would be done would be to cite half a dozen leading gentlemen of this House before the Governor General to hear our views, and if he had substantial proof that the course we were taking was in the interests of Canada his Ministry would be dismissed and sent to the country. Now, how could that be done supposing this House represented the property of the country? They would at once object and say "You must not send the Ministers back to the country for election; we are the people; we are the country." His Excellency would not listen to such a proposal; but would say that his Ministers had obtained power from the country by votes obtained in the proper and constitutional manner from the people and until he lost confidence in these Ministers, he was bound to take their advice and if the ministers could shew that the course of the Senate was not warranted by the facts and circumstances he would say "gentlemen, if you persist in your opposition and refuse to pass the Supply Bill, then, you must go to the country," and I do not see why we should adopt the plan proposed by the hon. gentleman from Aadia that would bring about such a state of affairs. I believe that the course taken at Confederation to consolidate British interests in British North America was the wisest and best that could be adopted, and the best proof of that, is the fact that for twenty years we have gone on peacefully in this Dominion without

having any difficulty except the little breeze we had recently in the North West. Therefore I say it would be unwise for us to tinker with the constitution until circumstances arise that necessitate it. The mingling of the tricolor and the Rose shews the homogenous nature of our people. I could not help smiling the other night, when I heard at a social gathering Frenchmen signing the Marseilles and Englishmen joining in the chorus and the next moment the English singing the "Red, White and Blue," and the Frenchmen joining in the chorus. I only thought that if our forefathers could have heard such a thing they would have turned in their graves. The Confederation of Canada is a lasting monument to the men who framed the constitution of this country. On one side of this building we have a monument to Sir George Cartier, a representative of the great French race without whose aid our constitution could not have been a success, and I do hope that on the opposite side of this building when the time comes, though I hope it may be far distant, we shall see another monument to Sir John Macdonald, so that other men who may take our places here will be reminded by these monuments to be very charey how they tinker with the constitution of this country.

Hon. Mr. OGILVIE—There is one thing that has been forgotten both this afternoon and this evening. Every gentleman that has spoken on this question, spoke of members of this House as if they had all been nominated by the Executive, and had never been elected. If anyone will take the trouble to analyse the list of Senators in this House, he will find that a very large majority of them, say nearly fifty, have been elected to one or the other branch of the Legislature, so that, after all, the majority of the members of this House are gentlemen who have been the choice of the people before they came here. That is one thing which hon. gentlemen should bear in mind. I cannot say that I feel, as some hon. gentlemen said this afternoon, very much obliged to the hon. gentleman who brought this question before the House, for in my mind it was quite unnecessary. I think it is quite time enough when we meet troubles to prepare to find some remedy for them. At present troubles do not