

every hon. gentleman who spoke professed a great, and almost undying faith in the necessity of two branches of parliament. There are few countries, I am free to admit, in which there are not two Houses. The kingdom of Greece, I believe, one of the latest founded kingdoms of Europe, has no second Chamber—and Norway—

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—Bulgaria. Norway is not yet formed.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—Bulgaria is not an absolutely independent country. In Norway the elected legislature is divided into two branches; as I understand their system, when it is elected, and they agree among themselves which shall be the upper and which the lower House. At any rate some principle like that exists in Norway. The idea of having two branches of parliament has its origin largely in the idea that there are two distinct sets of people to be looked after, and that one division of the country in some way or other,—either the peers, noblemen, land-owners, or some particular body of the people—has to be cared for by a particular branch of parliament. The English House of Lords is probably one of the oldest organizations in the world, but there was a time in English history, probably, when there was no House but the House of Lords. The King called in the great nobles, as the hon. gentleman from Shediac (Hon. Mr. Poirier) mentioned the other day, the King called his earls; he was first among his equals, and called them together for a great enterprise, and that was, no doubt, the origin of the first parliamentary assemblies in England if you choose to call them parliamentary; but, in time, when the cities became large and wealthy, the King called in representatives from the people as well, so that he might levy the taxes which were necessary, as well as to get from the lords and earls the men to follow in his battles. In time the representative body over-shadowed the other. The House of Lords, however, continued to meet first with the representatives of the towns and cities, but finally continued its existence by itself, and it existed in some form down to the time of Cromwell. When England became a republic, in the time of Cromwell, the House of Lords for quite a while disappeared. There was but one House

until Cromwell, finding the lower House too strong for him, composed a House of Peers of his own, which was the laughing stock of the old English peerage, so that the House of Lords, as it exists to-day, and the peers as they exist to-day, are very largely the out-growth or have come in since, the Cromwellian period. Several hon. gentlemen who have spoken, indeed almost every hon. gentleman who has made observations on this question in the House, made a reference to the Senate of the United States, and there seems to be a terrible fear of that body. My hon. friend from Marshfield, one of the shrewdest men in the House, appeared to be willing to do the Senate of the United States a certain amount of justice, but my hon. friend from Smith's Falls was terribly in earnest in his dislike of that body. He saw in it a great cause for worry. Now it is well to remember that in the United States you have the development of the English system as it existed at the time the constitution of the national union was adopted. The United States system was founded upon somewhat different lines from the way in which we have developed, but nevertheless it is a national development, and it is a national institution. There was a time in England when there was no cabinet; and there is not a cabinet in the United States to-day in the sense in which we understand the cabinet, and the Senate of the United States is founded upon the old idea that there should be a body to assist the King and assist the ruler of the country, and to divide with him, in part at least, the power which he possessed. Therefore, the Senate of the United States has the power of confirming appointments which are made by the President. No appointment can be made by the President without the consent of the Senate of the United States. It is therefore an executive body. The hon. gentleman from Marshfield objected strongly to the secret sessions of the Senate of the United States. I can readily understand why there are secret sessions of the Senate when they are dealing with certain matters. The Privy Council of Canada hold secret session, and when any hon. gentlemen seeks to obtain information from the Secretary of State when he is not prepared to give it, he can easily understand that secrecy extends to the delibera-