

Senate has had the courage of its convictions, and it has been honest enough to express them, not only in word but in deed, and by its votes. That has brought down the condemnation of those who have been denouncing the Senate as a useless body, and at the same time condemning them for exercising their own opinions and judgments upon important questions affecting the great and material interests of the country. Within a short time we had an utterance from the hon. Minister of Public Works. I have no doubt it was very interesting to the members of the Senate, but if I read it, I trust it will not frighten them and that they will not be under any apprehension as to what is to follow. At a dinner given in the city of Montreal to the Minister of Public Works, referring to the Senate, he says :

You can rely upon our good will and we must count equally on yours.

That is speaking to the people.

We have eminent men in the House of Commons and in the Cabinet.

Of course we would expect that, knowing that the hon. gentleman was there himself.

And in the Senate the majority are not worth the rope to hang them. Reforms are necessary and to accomplish them we can depend on your good will and unity.

The hon. Premier, who spoke immediately after the Minister of Public Works, used this language :—

You appreciate him, (that is the Hon. Mr. Tarte) and so do I.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—So did Mercier.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—
And he further says :—

I think I have known him longer than you have.

And consequently, he knew better how to appreciate him. Then we have *La Patrie*, that \$30,000 organ of the party, throwing out its threat that if the Senate dared to express opinions upon some questions and to reject certain measures which it foreshadow may be brought before it, that we must be annihilated. The *Globe*, the other day, uttered its warning voice against us if we dared to reject the Yukon Railway deal, as we had rejected the Drummond County

deal. The *Hamilton Times* has also been muttering its threats against the Senate if we dare to have any such opinions ; but after all, when we think of the utterances of the hon. seconder of the motion for the adoption of the address, and particularly after his utterances at a dinner party in Montreal as to how he, among others, was to use his power and influence in reforming this body, we may rest safely for at least a time. If I understood the hon. gentleman's language when he addressed the House, he said :

The history of the Senate showed that it had always acted with wisdom, prudence, and a due responsibility to the popular will, and for this the public was disposed to forgive it for being a non-representative and irresponsible body.

I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but that is what I understood him to say ; and what, I think, has been reported. Still, we may rest content since he has given us a certificate of character of acting with wisdom and prudence, and it only proves to me that the moment an hon. gentleman enters the Senate, it appears that the benign influences by which he is surrounded, and the general company in which he finds himself, and the conservative character of the Senate, so mollifies his opinion that he becomes as mild as a suckling dove—one of ourselves. Then I have, in addition to that, and I desire to put this matter on record, the opinion of the present Minister of Justice, and I frankly confess that when I read the remarks of the hon. gentleman at a demonstration given in his honour when accepting that important portfolio which he now holds, I read it with pleasure, though I have no recollection during the 25 or 30 years I have known him, of ever hearing him speak of abolishing the Upper House. The hon. gentleman, the Minister of Justice, said in his speech delivered at Ridgeway, on the 26th November last :

It is sometimes argued that we ought to have but one House. He did not accept that view, and he was free to say after he had become for the time being, at all events (I do not know whether that indicates that the hon. gentleman intends to descend to the other House), a member of another Chamber, what he had said before he entered it, that it would be a very dangerous experiment where a government had large questions to deal with—and every government would have such questions from time to time to solve, and in times of excitement that government should be entirely under the control of one Chamber, if the whole power is in the hands of one Assembly, and that Assembly had behind it an excited public, there would be no guarantee of justice and fair dealing. The great advantage of two Houses is this, that it leaves upon the members of the House that is dominant the ever present impression that it cannot do wholly as it pleases.