

● (1440)

Apart from that altogether, I have not the slightest doubt in the world that if my honourable friend will listen to the rest of Senator Thompson's speech he will be able to see that Senator Thompson can clearly establish a connection between his views on Canada Day and the propriety of amending other statutes in our system of laws to reflect that change of name. There is just no question in the world that if he wants to establish that connection he can do so.

**Senator Frith:** You would dissolve in laughter over there if I were to maintain that.

**Senator Roblin:** I think I will let him say how he is going to do it, because I feel confident that he is able to do that. I do not think it would take a parliamentarian as clever as the Honourable Deputy Leader of the Government to structure his speech in such a way that it bears on the principle of this bill, which is, namely, whether or not we should apply the name "Canada Day" to Dominion Day, as it appears in the Interpretation Act, the Bills of Exchange Act and the Canada Labour Code, and perhaps some other statutes. I think Senator Thompson should be given the privilege of addressing this house and expressing his views.

**Senator Thompson:** I thank the Deputy Leader of the Government for raising the point, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for explaining to the Deputy Leader of the Government what the point obviously is. Parliament having previously enacted that Dominion Day should be called Canada Day, we are now moving on to the procedure for making consequential amendments to other legislation, the principle being established. Now, on second reading, as I understand it, we can debate the principle of amending these other statutes. It is on that basis that I wish to speak.

As I was saying, the regalia and the ritual in this chamber causes us to ask ourselves: As a symbol, what does the whole chamber represent to the Canadian people? I look, for example, at the mace. I think, as Lord Campion said, that there is a halo about the mace. I am broadening now to go into other areas of symbols, and, therefore, I refer to the mace. I suggest that the mace does indeed have a mystic and spiritual quality to it. It reaches back into the myths of early civilizations; to Moses, when he, with his rod, came down from the mountain.

I want to emphasize the significance of the mace in this chamber. To me, it represents the courage that has been shown in our long history of evolving constitutional government, of fighting the autocratic powers of the Crown, which had the authority and the symbol of the mace. I am sure every honourable senator knows that the mace was carried by the Sergeants at Arms of Richard I of England, and Philip II of France, to ensure their authority. Over the centuries the authority of the king, through the symbol of the mace, became the protection of the Speaker, and then the authority to the Speaker, and thus of the whole of this assembly and the people.

I should like to recall in this debate the accountability of the executive, or the Crown, to the people and to Parliament. I

should like honourable senators to be imbued with pride in the knowledge that we sit here because of the struggles and achievements of men through the centuries.

I think of the absolute power of the monarch during the Tudor period. I recall to your memory Queen Elizabeth I of England, with all the awesome authority that she could command, and her impatience at having to listen to the forum of Parliament. I recall Sir Edward Coke's being called before the Bar and told, "What we expect is that you say aye or no, and we do not want anything else." When he returned to Parliament, Peter Wentworth stood on his feet, and against the wishes and desires of the monarch moved the resolution of succession. What was the fate of Peter Wentworth for doing that? He, of course, was sent to the Tower, where he remained.

When I follow the roots of this chamber and the symbolism that is with us, I think in terms of the Stuart period. With all respect to His Honour, I think of another Speaker in another time, Sir John Finch, and the irritation, impatience and fury of the king concerning Parliament. Speaker Finch refused to put Sir John Eliot's protestations and was about to adjourn the house by the king's command, but he was held in the Chair, cringing and crying, by Holles and another member. The Speaker understood the awesome power of the king, and he wanted the members to keep quiet. However, there were men like Eliot and Holles who refused to be intimidated, and who demanded that decisions respecting the law and the treatment of subjects be made in Parliament, even though they were sent to jail.

This, of course, again symbolizes the struggle of the monarchy, with its feeling of Divine Right, to avoid, at all costs, having to face the forum of Parliament.

We think, honourable senators, of Charles I, and how he, impatient with Parliament, which was trying to check his methods of taxation by going outside Parliament for tonnage and poundage, and doing it by asking for loans from people, with all the coercion that the monarch could exert, made the blunder of going down to the House himself. He was the first and only monarch to cross the Bar of Parliament. When he walked up, there was an intense silence throughout the House. Parliament knew he was coming to arrest five members, and leave was given to those five members to absent themselves.

● (1450)

King Charles strode up to the Speaker and said, "By your leave, Mr. Speaker, I must borrow your chair a little." He then turned and called the names of two of the members he intended to arrest on a charge of treason. He turned to Speaker Lenthall, who, in a few words, made a speech which should ring out a message to all of us. In essence, he said that he had "neither eyes to see, not tongue to speak" but as the representatives of the people were pleased to direct him.

Honourable senators, Speaker Lenthall stands out like a beacon for his courage in demonstrating and asserting the independence of Parliament.