

it has secured the appointment of party henchmen: men who preferred a seat in the Red Chamber to the possibilities of an election; rather than the appointment of practical statesmen. Our Senate has become the creature and tool of the Cabinet, or to quote Marriott, "that Senate devised with the idea of giving representation to provincial interests, has been manipulated in such a way as to subserve primarily the interests of the central executive."

The inference from my previous assertion, "that the Senate as at present constituted performs no useful service," may be that we should abolish it. By no means is this my contention. For the Senate has a separate and distinct place in our polity and should not be abolished.

As already stated, our Upper House was originally designed to afford equal representation to the provinces of the federation, thus in it is reflected and embodied the federal character of our Polity. Therefore, its abolition would necessitate the altering of our constitution, and experience has proved how dangerous it is to tamper with the genius of a constitution.

The unitary character of our constitution also impresses upon our minds the necessity of a Second Chamber. History proves to us that a Unitary Constitution and a Unicameral system are irreconcilable. It recalls to our minds England's sad experience with a Unitary Constitution and only one House, when during Cromwell's time, the "Rump," after murdering the King and abolishing the House of Lords, became the sole power. Then, contrary to expectations, the people were least represented, and as Marriott says, "England experienced the horriddest arbitrariness that ever existed on earth." Nor can this failure of the Unicameral System be attributed to the incompetency of the governing body. For, when the "Rump" was expelled from power and succeeded by the Puritan convention, arbitrariness reached its climax. And the surprising degree of unanimity which the proposal for a Bicameral System received clearly demonstrates the unpopularity of the Unicameral System. The failure of the experiment forced even Cromwell to assert, "Unless we have some such thing as an Upper Chamber as a balance we cannot be safe."

The rare unanimity with which the civilized world has decided in favour of the Bicameral legislature strongly suggests to us another reason for the retention of our Senate. The progressive nations of the world have clung, despite wide differences of circumstances and contrasted forms of constitution, to the Bi-