

mode of filling the Chamber, allowing the Crown a certain number, allowing the Local Legislatures a certain number, and allowing the people a portion would be an improvement. In that way you would get a variety. As it is now, the Crown alone appoints and I think I have shown that when the people were entrusted with the selection they exercised their power wisely and well. The hon. gentleman has said that in dealing with this question every hon. Senator might feel that he could do so wholly irrespective of any personal feelings or motives, because in the reconstruction of this Chamber, no doubt, those who have been appointed for life will continue to hold their positions, and our ambition should be, as Canadians, to improve, if possible, the constitution of our country. It is open for us to do so. The tendency of the present day all over the world is to elective institutions. The system may not be as good, but at all events people recognize that it is the better way. It is the way they like. The world now is to be governed for the people; they are dictating how the countries shall be governed, and no doubt that is the proper thing—government by the people for the people for the greatest possible good. In dealing with this question, therefore, every hon. gentleman ought to express his views freely and he can afford to be a perfectly independent witness because he is, at all events, sure of his own position here. And he must have an opinion whether it is better in the interests of the country that this House should be elected by the people or nominated by the Government of the day.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)—I desire to say a few words on this subject, inasmuch as four years ago I placed on record my views in the same direction as those stated by our hon. colleague who introduced this subject. And in order to be as brief as possible I will just read to the House what I stated on that occasion. It will be found in the official reports of the debates of this House for the year 1886—page 333. It was on a motion brought up by the hon. gentleman from Woodstock, I there expressed myself in the following language:—

“If the present Government remain much longer in power I have every reason to believe that the Senate will not remain as at present constituted for another five years.”

The five years are not up yet, but I am happy to see that there is a hopeful sign when this young appointee to this Chamber is taking the matter up. The report of what I said on that occasion continues:

“My idea is that the constitution of the Senate ought to be changed without delay. I believe that the Provinces, or rather the Local Legislatures, ought to appoint the members of the Senate for life or for a very long period of years. Next best to having the Senators appointed by the Local Legislatures, let them be elected by the people for a period of from nine to twelve years, and let one-third retire every three or four years.

“HON. MR. KAULBACH—More provincialism.

“HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)—I believe that if the Provinces had the appointing of the Senators, they would come here and feel that they were not under any obligation to the right hon. leader of the Government or the leader of the Opposition, that they would come here as true representatives of the Provinces, in the first place; and, after that, the interests of the Dominion as a whole. What is the fact to-day? There is not a member here who has received his appointment from either Government that does not feel more or less restraint or obligation to the party, or leader of the party, that appointed him, and members are to that extent shackled and bound. In many instances, I am quite satisfied that hon. gentlemen here would take a different stand from what they do, were it not that they feel they owe their appointment to the present Government, and consequently must support all measures introduced by them. If they came here, as I have suggested, as representatives of the Provinces, they would come not knowing one party or the other, but would come to discharge their duty to the country, and I believe the sooner that system is adopted the sooner this House will become what it was intended to be, a grand judicial, deliberative body, and a check on crude legislation emanating from the other House—not a mere recording body, as we have been for a very considerable time.”

These were the views I held four years ago. I still retain them and I heartily endorse nearly all that has fallen from the hon. gentleman who introduced this motion with one exception, and that is that he stated he found no fault with not having Ministers holding portfolios on the floor of this Chamber. Now, I have been a member of this House for eight years. When I came here there were two hon. gentlemen holding portfolios in the Government on the floor of this Chamber, and I believe during the Mackenzie administration there were three.

HON. MR. DICKEY.—Letellier de St. Just was one of the Ministers during the Mackenzie regime. There were three in the first year of the Mackenzie administration.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)—And unfortunately they came down to one, and for the last two or three years we have