

establishing an Upper House. They have—reasoning doubtless from the same premises—not only given the legislatures of the respective states the power of nominating the members of the Senate, but have also given that body powers entirely different from those possessed by the elective branch. It is a remarkable fact that there is only one other government in Europe which has a system similar to Great Britain, and that is Sweden. There is another class, represented by a number of the German nations. There are Wurtemberg, Hesse Darmstadt, Prussia, Saxony, Hanover, Baden and Bavaria, with an aggregate population of about 30,000,000, whose Upper Chambers are partly hereditary, partly nominative, and partly *ex-officio*. The purely hereditary principle, as found in Great Britain and Sweden, obtains among a population of some 32,000,000. Then there is another class nominated by the Crown for life from a list chosen by intermediate bodies. The councils choose three lists and the Sovereign nominates therefrom. In this way, Spain, Brazil and the new nation of Roumania, composed of the Turkish principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, appoint their Upper Houses—Spain, with a population of 16,801,850; Brazil, 7,677,800; Roumania, 3,578,000; altogether 27,556,650. There is another class where the members of the Senate are nominated for life, where the number is limited, and where some few members of the royal family have the privilege of sitting as members. Italy, with a population of 21,777,334; Portugal, 3,584,677; Servia, 1,098,281; Austria, 34,000,000. This class represents altogether a population of 61,460,292. Then there is another class where the members are elected for a term of years, and it is a remarkable fact in this connection that the countries I refer to are, with the exception of three British colonies and one monarchy, entirely republican. The one monarchy in the list that elects its Upper Chamber in this way, is Belgium; but Belgium, although a monarchy, is well known to be one of the most democratic countries in Europe. This list includes Switzerland, whose people number 2,534,242; La Plata, 1,171,800; Chili, 1,558,319; Peru, 2,865,000; United States, 30,000,000; Liberia, 500,000; Belgium, 4,529,000; South Australia, 126,830; Tasmania, 89,977; Victoria, 540,322—having a total population of 43,915,490. In Nassau we find the Upper Chamber partly nominative and partly *ex-officio*, the population being 457,571. Then there is Denmark,

with a partly nominative and partly elective system, the elections being held by the Provincial Councils, the population being 1,600,000; while in the Netherlands, with a population of 3,372,652, the members are elected entirely by the Provincial Councils. In one of the British colonies, New South Wales, the members are nominated for a term of years; whilst in two of the youngest and most enterprising of the British colonies, New Zealand and Queensland, they have the system which we propose to adopt, of nominating a limited number of members for life. There is evidently room here for great latitude of opinion as to the constitution of the Upper Chamber, and I do not think we can be fairly charged with retrogression because we choose to make the members of our Upper House nominative instead of elective. Our people comprise but one class, and if the members of the two chambers are to be chosen by the same electors, it is very clear that it will be extremely difficult for both to maintain their individuality, possessing similar powers and privileges, and avoid collisions. It is evident that two chambers which have originated in precisely the same way, will claim to exercise the same rights and privileges, and to discharge the same functions; but were the Upper Chamber nominative, instead of elective, the jurisdiction of that chamber would be, of course, correspondingly changed, and the chances of collision made more remote. There are quite a number of states (some of them very considerable in size and population, and of recent origin) which have dispensed with an Upper Chamber altogether. I confess my arguments would lead to the adoption of this system, as the one most suited to our circumstances. (Hear, hear.) The nations which have adopted this system are Hesse Cassel, with a population of 726,000; Luxemburg, 413,000; Saxe Weimar, 273,000; Saxe Meiningen, 172,000; Saxe Altenburg, 137,000; Saxe Cobourg, 159,000; Brunswick, 273,000; Mecklenburg Schwerin, 548,000; Norway, 1,328,471; Mecklenburg Strelitz, 99,060; Oldenburg, 295,245; Anhalt, 181,824; Lippe-Detmold, 108,513; Waldeck, 58,000; Schwarzburg, 71,913; and in the kingdom of Greece, with a population of 1,096,810, where a new constitution has been recently adopted, the statesmen of that country have, after some experience of the duplicate system, resolved to legislate with a single chamber. But while it is my opinion that we would be better without an Upper House, I know that the question is