

and a Liberal Government occupy the place of those who have been in power now for so many years. In that case there might be a great deal of antagonism between the two Houses, and it might be found difficult or impossible to conduct public business with an Opposition so numerous and able; but if it is found that the members coming into this Senate as vacancies occur, are men elected by the people, and that those, if any, who resigned their seats and went back to the people, were elected by propertied constituencies, it would then lead up to this point, that the Senate would be a highly respected and very able and unobjectionable body in all its details. I rather regret that the House wished that the debate should proceed to-day, because I believe I could have produced some examples of high mark with regard to the necessity of an upper Chamber, but fortunately the debate has not taken that turn at all. I do not think any member who has spoken has expressed a desire for the abolition of the upper Chamber. There is one thing I shall refer to before I resume my seat, and I know it has been urged by gentlemen of great experience in public life, for whose opinions I have the greatest respect myself, but I do not think, considering the great difference between this body and the Senate of the United States, that it would be at all expedient to diminish the numbers. I think it would be a great evil if the Senate were reduced to half its present number. That has been proposed by some, and I think, without much expediency. I thank the House for its attention, and hope that when the day comes that a change is necessary it may be in the direction of an elective Senate elected by propertied constituencies.

HON. MR. POWER—The subject brought before the House by the hon. gentleman from Shediac is a very important one. I think there is very little difference of opinion amongst the members of this House or amongst the members of the House of Commons or amongst the people outside, that the present status of the Senate is not satisfactory. There is no question about that. Then the question is as to the remedy. Although I think it is felt everywhere that the Senate is not just in the position in which it should be, I have not heard it alleged by

any hon. gentleman who has spoken to-day, and I do not know that it has been very generally alleged outside, that there is any special fault to be found with the personnel of the Senate. It is only natural that we should flatter ourselves, and say we are the right kind of men for the position, but I think that that is really the fact. I have not seen that there is anywhere much fault found with the personnel of the Senate. We may not be giants of intellect, but I think we have in the Senate enough brains to constitute a useful branch of Parliament, a much more useful one than we have so far proved ourselves. There is no doubt about that fact; and it is a fact that the status is not what it ought to be—the Senate is not playing that part in the legislation of the country that it should, but it is not the fact that the fault is in the personnel of the Senate. Then what is the difficulty? That is the question which I do not think, if I may say so, has been satisfactorily answered. I know that the hon. gentleman from Shediac, who brought the matter before the House, and the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, both took the same ground, that the reason why the Senate is not as well thought of as it ought to be was that the Senate is not in touch with the people. That is a very indefinite sort of term—in touch with the people. The hon. gentleman from Shediac undertook to tell us what he meant by not being in touch with the people, and what he meant was that the Senate was appointed by the Crown, and that under responsible government an upper House appointed by the Crown was an anomaly. He said it was an illogical sort of body. I do not look at the matter altogether in that way. It is not alleged that the House of Lords in England is altogether an illogical body, and the hon. gentleman said that the House of Lords had a reason for being. The members of the House of Lords were originally, as the hon. gentleman said, appointed by the Crown—by the monarch in his individual capacity, and not as one of the three estates of Parliament. At that time, the position of the Lords was a consistent one. The King at that time was not only the source of honor but the source of power. At that time, the members of the House of Lords were appointed by the authority which was then really the supreme power in the State. Since the passage of the