

But the fundamental objection to this legislative body as now constituted is, that it does not represent the people or any great public interest, and that it is wholly irresponsible to the people, as the majority act as if they owed responsibility to no one but the party chief whose creatures they are. The British House of Lords is by no means so heedless of public opinion or so irresponsible as the Dominion Senate. The *Globe*, in commenting upon the merits of these two bodies, remarks that "the experience of Canada shows that an Upper Chamber elected as our Senate is may be a much greater enemy to popular liberties, much more obstructive and much more ready to do wrong in the interests of party than a House of hereditary peers. The British peers are nearly all men of large landed property, who naturally highly the interests of their class, and generally perceive before it is too late when an obstinate persistence in opposing the public will may lead to the destruction of their privileges and to the lasting injury of their class; and therefore it is that the House of Lords, although the majority are Tories, always yield to popular demands strongly and consistently pressed. The members of our Senate are influenced by no such considerations. They risk nothing by obstinately resisting the popular will in the interest of their party, because they have nothing to lose; and that they are seldom actuated by a sense of right, seldom influenced by patriotic motives, seldom free from the bonds of party, they have abundantly proved."

But the anomaly of the present Upper House becomes still more glaring and objectionable when we see the Senate made a camping-ground for worn-out politicians and party hacks who cannot find constituencies. A very large number of those compos-