

can states and a few of the Canadian provinces have ever attempted the unicameral formation. So universal a practice must surely rest, then, upon some fundamental principle in political philosophy! It is doubtful, too, I think, if the appeal to history alone can solve the problem. We must look deeper into the psychological motives which always underlie political history if we would find a solution.

The upper chamber, then, in England, the House of Lords, for example, was designed, in the first instance, to represent the interest—and I use that word in its true, full sense covering all legitimate human interests and not in the narrow, sordid, contemptuous sense covering merely the predatory financial and trading interests in the community. At first, however, the only interests recognized were the two prevailing interests, the land-owning and ecclesiastical interests, the Lords of the Land and the Lords Spiritual. In course of time, however, other multiplying interests, the interests, for example, of statecraft, legal learning, commerce, industry and philanthropy, began to be recognized. Even the interests of science, literature and art were grudgingly admitted. Suppose now that all these interests, including, for example, the interests of labour, had been freely and equitably recognized from time to time at their full human value, would the House of Lords have ever fallen into its present position of inferiority? Would there ever even have been a House of Commons at all? Or to come down to date, would there ever have been a labour government in England? These are interesting questions. The point, however, is that these new, multiplying interests to which we have referred were not recognized on any just scale of human values, with the inevitable result that the doctrine of interests was superseded by a doctrine of will. The arbitrary will of a majority of the electors was substituted for the numerous legitimate interests of all the people, clearly a backward step in political theory, if a forward step for the time being in political practice. Hence, the House of Commons, as we now know it, representing the will of a majority of

the voters, and a House of Lords representing in a very imperfect way a few of the more conservative prevailing interests in the community. The imperfections of this mechanism are, we are inclined to think, too obvious to call for extended treatment. From the very beginning, indeed, the various prevailing class interests in the community have attempted by bribery, gerrymandering, executive patronage and sometimes by open assault upon the constitution and the law, to defeat the will of the majority of voters. These classes feel, usually, I suggest, with more honesty than we are always willing to concede, that the arbitrary will of the majority is oppressive and unfair to them. Certainly the interests of more recent origin, always a small minority in any community, have very little more chance of success under the present system than under the old one. The democracy has become rapidly bigger in wealth and power and increasingly unrestful, turbulent and arrogant in recent years, but has it really become any richer in the higher human values? Why is it that so few men of fine taste, high learning, successful experience or marked ability of any kind refuse to play their part in the active public life of the community? Why the prevailing maxim: "Keep out of Politics"?

Now it so happens that the Senate of Canada was originally designed to become the very kind of parliamentary body which the House of Lords in England failed to become. The fathers of Confederation had the conspicuous failure of the English House of Lords and the equally conspicuous success of the Senate of the United States to guide them. They knew that the hereditary principle was chiefly responsible for the failure of the House of Lords and they also feared the danger of deadlock if they made the Senate an elected body as it is in the United States. They recognized clearly that under the Limited Monarchy a deadlock between the two chambers of the legislature would be incurable, since there is no third body like the President to settle the dispute and relieve the impasse. They also feared that an elected Senate might reduce the power and prestige of the House of Commons

as it had admittedly reduced the power and prestige of the House of Representatives in the United States. So they finally decided to take a middle course and create a Senate whose members should be appointed for life by the Governor-general in Council. Whether they took the best course or not I dare not say. I leave that task to those who think that they have canvassed all the possibilities of a perfect system of government in a very imperfect community. One thing, however, is clear and that is that the craftsmen of the Constitution of Canada tried to design an Upper Chamber which would fairly, impartially, judicially in open public assembly and subject to constant public criticism, represent and respect the interests of every class and community in the union and act as a balance wheel or check upon the too arbitrary, hasty, uncertain will of a mere majority of voters represented by the House of Commons. Sir John MacDonald described the Senate as "The sober second thought in legislation" and the Hon. Senator McDonald addressed its first session in the following words:—

"It seems to me that our functions may be exercised most usefully, not as refiners of executive opinion on the one hand, not servile echoes of fleeting popular feeling on the other, but as the balance wheel of this government, guiding always, obstructing never."

The following words of the lamented martyr, Thomas D'Arcy McGee, may also be quoted here:—

"As to the Senate we have all the best constitutional authorities with us that a second chamber ought not to stand on the electoral basis of the first; and so long as our Senate continues to be a fair representation of all our real interests, so long it will be looked up to and obeyed. If it is to be undermined, it will be by the abuse of executive patronage and not by the substitution of the principle of selection for that of election as applied to that house."

The above words are both prophetic and pathetic. Will some philanthropist please offer a billion dollars for a prize for some one who will discover a cure for executive patronage that deadly disease in all forms of human government. The money would be well spent.

Educational Notes

(By "Spectator.")

"One ship drives East and another West
With the self-same winds that blow,
'Tis the set of the sails, and not the gales,
Which decides the way to go.

"Like the winds of the sea and the ways of fate
As we voyage along through life,
'Tis the will of the soul that decides the goal,
And not the calm or the strife."

* * * *

"Nineteen twenty-four" has gone the way of past millenniums, and "nineteen twenty-five" has come upon the stage with cheery countenance and friendly bow. "Nineteen twenty-four" has left behind him a heritage—a miscellaneous legacy of things good, bad and indifferent. Of these the consciousness of humanity will in time sort out the good, adding it to the world's accumulated working capital: the indifferent

and the bad will, in the lapse of years, come to forgetfulness. So the world moves.

"Nineteen twenty-five" has come bearing gifts. Let us not squander these, nor hide them in a napkin. Let us trade with them, so that when the last of the three hundred and sixty-five golden days has paid out the last of its golden minutes, though weariness may overtake us, we shall wear the smile of the souls who have heard the whispered "Well done" from the celestial lips of the victorious spirits who have gone before.

* * * *

"Nineteen twenty-five" is, without peradventure, in educational circles in our good city of Vancouver, a year of grace. Here, "Hope springs eternal," and not without reason. Our institutions of learning have completed a good year's work, and bid fair to give us something even better in the year now with us. The