

That, I think, is sufficient to confirm the opinion I have expressed, that we should not follow the example of the House of Lords. Looking at the constitutions of the different legislatures of the world, I would rather take the American Senate as an example. Mr. Bright expresses the opinion that the Senate of the United States is *facile princeps* at the head of all the Senates of the world; is in his opinion an ideal one. From Jefferson to John C. Spooner, the present senator from Wisconsin who leads that House at the present day, they have always had the best and ablest men of the country. I was astonished to find that the hon. gentleman from Marshfield had anything to say in disparagement of that chamber. When I look back and reflect on the names of Webster, Calhoun, Clay, Everett and others, I am at a loss to imagine how this great body can be entitled to anything else than the highest respect. The hon. gentleman claimed that they were inferior in diplomatic ability. Now, I think, if there is one country in the world which has evidence of the astuteness, not to say cunning, and ability of the United States, and of their diplomatic skill, it is Canada. From the time of the unfortunate Ashburton treaty to the time of the Geneva award, and down to the present, no one who looks at the map of Canada can fail to see ample evidence of the shrewdness and ability of the United States as a diplomatic power. Some hon. gentleman says, 'sharp practice.' It was reported generally that they were offered the whole of Canada in the Geneva award if they would give up other claims elsewhere. I only give that as a report, that is how it came to me. Now, this gentleman whom the hon. gentleman from Marshfield quoted, Mr. Bryce, whose work every senator ought to read, says:

The smallness and the permanence of the Senate have, however, another important influence on its character. They contribute to one main cause of its success, the superior intellectual quality of its members. Every European who has described it has dwelt on the capacity of those who compose it, and most have followed De Tocqueville in attributing this capacity to the method of double election. The choice of senators by the state legislatures is supposed to have proved a better means than direct choice by the people of discovering and selecting the fittest men.

He is unqualified in his praise of the American Senate, and at all events that great system of committees which we have and

which is so successful here, is derived from the United States. But I am not going to make an invidious distinction in that line; it does not come within the scope of the resolution. The resolution of the hon. gentleman from Mille Isles has called forth a great deal of attention. It has been made the subject of comment by the press of Canada, and for the first time in my life I find that the press can be given an unqualified meed of praise for the very handsome manner in which they have treated the Senate in connection with the resolution. What are the causes of any animadversion which may have been made with reference to the Senate? I need not go very deeply into this subject, because I find one of the principal causes at hand. I attribute the disparagement of the Senate largely to the numerous adjournments which have taken place here. In 1898 these adjournments extended over a period of thirty-nine days, in 1899 over thirty days, in 1900 over fifty-nine days, in 1901 ten days, in 1902 nineteen days; then in 1903 the number reached sixty-one days; in 1904 it runs down to forty-four. In 1905 it is sixty-one days again. Such a length of time taken out of the session of this House is calculated to attract public attention. Furthermore, some hon. gentlemen who have attended regularly this year did not attend so regularly heretofore. If I had the number of members who were absent during previous sessions with the length of time in each case, it would make a very bad showing I am afraid, but I have only taken the number of days of actual adjournment, excluding Saturdays and Sundays. It may be said, we do all the work. I suppose we do, but we do it in a hurried manner, and it is that I complain of. I have seen eighteen or nineteen Bills run through in half an hour in the rapid manner—I do not say it in any disparaging way—in which our Speaker has attained such excellence. He is unexcelled by any other Speaker I ever saw in his ability to facilitate business in that way. Another thing, I have seen members nod at the Speaker for a second reading of a Bill. A formal motion should be made, and the senator should arise and explain the Bill in due form. This is a small matter perhaps, but it shows laxity and it is a fault. 'He that contemneth small things shall fall by little and little.' Another cause for criticism is the sudden invasion of politi-