

the cause of the trouble. In the first place, I would have a larger quorum. A small quorum allows members to absent themselves, and they should be made to come here. My own opinion is that this House should require one-half of its membership to constitute a quorum. Then I would have the oath which the senator takes, one with regard to the nation—that he would recognize no party in his deliberations in this Senate—and I am sure that I am perfectly willing to take that oath myself. Then again I think the age limit should be a little different. The extraordinary number of senators dying has left the Premier without any difficulty whatever. He has been able to fill up the gaps, and he has filled them up very well. They are not a bad lot of men, and I do not think he could pick out better ones than he has, considering the nature of their politics. However, that is a pure accident. To show you how this House is able to take care of itself in that respect, just let me give you, not my own views, but the views of an able member of the House of Lords, the Earl of Pembroke, with reference to this. On page 50 of his work he says:—

All attempts to equalize parties on the principle of nomination have been found to be useless because Liberal politicians become Conservatives almost as fast as they can be created on entering the independent atmosphere of the House of Lords. I believe that all such attempts must, if not futile, certainly be mischievous, because they encourage a wrong idea of what the spirit and functions of the House of Lords should be. The House of Lords should certainly not be the place for constant party struggles and attempts to win party victories in the division lobbies. The spirit of party cannot of course be altogether excluded from any assembly connected with English politics; but it is the peculiar duty of the House of Lords to take a national rather than a party view of political questions and for this purpose it is specially fitted by its constitution.

It is quite a mistake to suppose that the Conservative majority in the House of Lords habitually sees its power to reject or nullify the measures of Liberal governments. Such occasions are the exceptions, not the rule. As a matter of fact there is never a session when a radical government is in power that the Conservative party do not put their party prejudices and even their conscientious opinions into their pockets again and again in deference to what they believe to be their party duty.

If we make the House representative of any electorate we shall inadvertently deprive it of this peculiar spirit. Members would be returned as representatives of parties, pledged to support the Conservative or the Liberal

caucus. With such an assembly as this for a second Chamber to have a Conservative party in one House when there is a Liberal one in the other would probably lead to an intolerable series of deadlocks.

That is enough for the elective system. The more you dilute a body the weaker it gets. If you take any spirit and dilute it, you will make it so that you will not notice the taste of it. So that I consider this nominative system by the Premier is essentially the best. If the Premier is an honest and honourable man, if he is as good as any in his party, what difference will there be between the party and him? The more you dilute the electorate the worse representative you get. The more you concentrate its essence and power, the better man you procure, and, therefore, if the government carries out its intention properly, you will find that you will get the very best men in the country. I have nothing to say against the members who have been appointed to the Senate. I think they are good representative men. So far as religious denominations are concerned and the different classes in the community, professional and secular, I think they are as good men as can be found. We have ecclesiastical representation in some of the states. Austria-Hungary has it, and so has England, but England has only one denomination. Several other countries have it—Prussia, Baden, Bavaria and Spain and Portugal to a slight extent, and so has Roumania. We could not have ecclesiastics in the Senate in this country for the simple reason that we would not know where to stop. To-day we were considering a Bill and we mustered up four denominations, but if you are to have ecclesiastical representatives here you would have about 25 or 30. Judging from the figures I have read to you of the Bundesrath, and the United States Senate above all others, which has 90 members on its roster to-day, the highest number for years. These 90 members represent a population of nearly one million each. I should say Canadian senators should represent at least 100,000. That would give 60 representatives, which would be plenty. With regard to the age of senators, I want to give the Premier and the nominative system as much scope as possible, but I would allow no man to enter the Senate under 40 years. That is the limit in France, Belgium, Germany and