

created them. And what was that power? The power of the provinces. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island did not agree to it in the Quebec conference. They said, 'We shall have a Senate, and nobody is to over-ride us.' New Brunswick said: 'We are going to have a Senate.' So did Nova Scotia; so did Quebec; so did Ontario; and the condition of giving us a Senate was to protect our legal and territorial rights, to protect our peculiar institutions such as they may be. 'We will give you a House of Commons to look over the vast concerns of this Dominion and to make the laws for the future prosperity of the Dominion of Canada.' Now, do you mean to say that body, which was created by that Quebec conference, with the consent of the provinces—that body subservient to the provinces—can go and destroy its creator? The thing is absurd; it is not consistent with any principle of common sense. If you are going to reform the Senate, go back to the provinces and ask them: 'Do you want a change in the Senate? Do you want a Senate at all?' That was the most absurd project yet made in the House of Commons—to abolish the Senate—as if the moon could abolish the sun; and as if the people of Canada could abolish the British constitution. Why, the thing is preposterous and next in degree of preposterousness—if that word be not too large—was to change from the nominative character of a Senate to an elective. They cannot do it. Would Quebec adhere to an elective Senate, or to its abolition? Would Ontario agree to it? I do not know whether it would or not. We had it at least for ten years, and we dropped it for the sake of Confederation, and I think we did wisely. Now, if hon. gentlemen would proceed regularly, and the Senate is tried by a proper jury, and is condemned to be guillotined after a proper trial, why, of course governments may go and come, in form, but governments in substance must stand forever; and whether you have a nominative Senate, or elective Senate, or no Senate at all, probably the Government of Canada will go on. The hon. gentlemen who are opposed to it, upon its present basis, may think they follow the Constitution, and agree upon a mode in which it is to be carried on in the future.

As a proof that the Senate is not partisan, I will give figures which I have

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS.

selected from a return that was brought down to the House some eight or nine years ago, and which, by the courtesy of the Assistant Clerk of the Senate, was continued down to 1913. This return shows a number of Bills that were rejected by the Senate, or amended, as sent up from the House of Commons, and the number that was amended or rejected by the House of Commons as sent down from the Senate. The Conservative party had the control of the Senate for 36 years out of the 46; we are now in the 47th year since Confederation. That was a long lease of office, and now there is overwhelming anxiety because that control does not continue to the present time. Is not that an aspiration far beyond the importance involved in it, far beyond what one would reasonably suppose any member of the House of Commons would aspire to—36 years' control of the Senate? Well, what happened? In the 24 years of Conservative majority in both Houses, the Senate amended 26 per cent of the Bills that came up before it, and rejected 1.7 per cent. That is, the Conservative Senate amended 26 per cent of the Bills sent up by the Conservative House of Commons, and the Conservative Senate rejected 1.7 per cent of the Bills sent up.

How had the Conservative Senate the audacity to amend so many Bills sent by its own friends? Because it was manly and independent, and the members felt they were doing their duty. See what happened again in the twelve years, when there was a Conservative majority in the Senate, and a Liberal majority in the House of Commons. The Senate amended 22 per cent of the Laurier Government Bills, and 26 per cent of the Bills introduced by Conservative leaders. The Senate amended fewer Bills sent by the Laurier Government, than it amended Bills sent by the Conservative Government, when the majority in the two houses were in accord. Is that proof of partisanship?

Hon. Mr. POWER—No, it is a proof that the Laurier Government Bills were better.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex)—I am astonished at the record of the Conservative Senate. The members rejected 4 per cent more Bills, than they had rejected under the other administration, but amended fewer. Then in the eight years when there was a Liberal majority in the Senate, and a Liberal majority in the House of