

The hon. member for East Hamilton had charged that the Liberal party was masquerading from one end of the country to the other in the garb of the Conservative party, a strange hallucination on the part of the hon. gentleman. The theory that the constitution could not be amended without the consent of the Provinces or the Senate was not a sound one, and in support of this contention he quoted Bystander as an authority. So far as he had read there could not be found the world over a second Chamber constituted, managed, filled and operated in the way characteristic of the Canadian Senate. (Government applause.) In Germany, Norway and other countries, Switzerland particularly, the method of appointing the upper House was almost the same as the method now proposed in Canada. Mention had been made by hon. gentlemen of the House of Lords, but he held that while there was contrast there was no comparison between that body and the Senate. If the House of Lords blocked legislation a sufficient number of new members could be appointed to remove the deadlock. Canada had no such safeguard; only under the most extraordinary circumstances, affecting Imperial policy, for instance, could Senators be added where a deadlock occurred, and then the number of appointments was limited to six. Speaking of the Yukon bill, he said the essence of that contract was speed. There was not time for the Government to submit the question to the people, and neither had the Senate bowed to the will of the people. They had simply blocked the bill, and as a result millions of dollars were finding their way into the pockets of merchants in Seattle, San Francisco and Sacramento, and into the coffers of American transportation companies, which should have gone to the merchants of Canada. It was worthy of remark, too, that the very men who had protested against the granting of the lands for the Yukon railway had in their day given millions of acres in land, millions in money and a big monopoly to the C. P. R. Mr. Graham then spoke of Sir Mackenzie Bowell. He did not desire, he said, that anything he might say should be construed as being disrespectful of that gentleman. But to-day hon. gentlemen opposite and Conservatives throughout the country were saying that he was the ideal man for managing the upper Chamber; that the country was safe so long as he was at the helm. Yet these were the very men who had assisted in putting the knife into him and completing his political assassination. If the Conservative leaders could not themselves trust him when he was their supposed chieftain, how could they ask that the people of Canada repose trust in him to-day? In conclusion, he recapitulated the objections to the Senate under its present constitution, and asked if Canada's progress and prosperity was to be worked out by her own people, on just and proper lines, or if her destiny was to be obstructed by an upper Chamber actuated by partisan motives.

Mr. Powell (Ottawa) said the views which had been expressed on the Government side were utterly at variance with the speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier at Montreal, wherein the Premier said the Senate was all right, but that on the occasion of a deadlock there should be a joint vote of both Houses, and the majority should prevail. Mr. Graham had argued for the abolition of the Senate. It would be better to abolish the Senate than to have a joint vote. Since Confederation the Senate had thrown out 47 public bills introduced under a Conservative Government and 18 public bills brought in under a Liberal Ministry. He cited this as an evidence that the Senate was not a partisan body.

Mr. Lumsden said there was a precedent for the reform of the Senate in the changes made in 1854 in the constitution of the Legislative Council, whereby it was provided that the members should be elected every ten years. The change deepened the independence and elevated the character of that body. So much independence was displayed that the Legislative Council refused to pass supply unless the system of holding migratory sessions of Parliament was stopped. The nomination of Senators to the Senate had been most baneful, and had converted the upper Chamber into a mere echo of Conservative Ministries. The Senators had been termed watch-dogs, but they had been dumb dogs whenever pernicious Conservative legislation had been proposed. The Senators simply carried out the behests of their Conservative masters. The resolution scarcely went far enough for him, but while it was not all he wanted, it was the best he could get, and therefore he would support it. He supported the motion not because he yielded any servile allegiance to the Government, but because it was in the best interests of the country.

Mr. Lucas maintained that the only purpose of the resolution was to bolster up the Dominion Liberals. It was a dangerous precedent for the Government to seek to obtain a declaration from the Legislature on a question outside its jurisdiction.

Closing Remarks.

Mr. Foy contended that the question was not one for discussion in the Local House, the members would be better employed looking after matters concerning the interests of their own Province. When, however, the Government had decided to bring the matter up they should have brought on the discussion at an earlier date. He spoke at some length against the resolution, and, in conclusion, said that it did not lie with this Province to make the first move in the direction of violating the principles of Confederation.

The division was taken shortly after 12 o'clock, the first vote being on the amendment to the amendment and resulting as follows:—

Yeas—Allen, Barr, Beatty (Leeds), Boyd, Brower, Carnegie, Carscallen, Colquhoun, Dempsey, Duff, Ellber, Fallis, Foy, Fox, Gallagher, Hodgins, Hoyle, Jamieson, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Kribs, Little, Lucas, Marter, Matheson, Miscampbell, Morrison, McDonald, Mc-