

not here to suit any premier or any leader of the opposition or anybody else. We are to do our own sweet will according to our judgment and good conscience. To say that we are an echo, is an offensive term.

Hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

### **Is the Senate an Echo?**

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex): A very offensive term was my hon. friend opposite an echo before 1896—I think he was in the House about that time, was he an echo? I think probably some hon. gentlemen who sit around me were in the House before 1896, before the Liberal government came into power. Were they echoes? I do not think they were, and I would be ashamed of my colleagues if I thought they were an echo of any voice except that of justice and propriety. Perhaps it might be interesting now to know what is the final decision of this House in regard to this Bill. I think it is probable that I shall move a resolution before I sit down, that the consideration of this Bill be deferred for sometime in the future. I do not think it will be any good at any time. I do not think it is any good at all just now. It may be revamped. It may be recast; it may be rehabilitated. If it turns up in some other form that is reasonably acceptable, we shall take it and be glad to help it. It is not an uncommon thing for Bills to be deferred. The terms of my resolution are well known to this House. When I was here in 1910, I remember the hon. leader of the House moving a resolution in these terms:

That all the words after the first word "that" be struck out and the following inserted: This House is not justified in giving its assent to this Bill until it is submitted to the judgment of the people.

Hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex): In 1910 he wanted to get the judgment of the people. Perhaps he knows what is the judgment of the people. He wanted to get the judgment of the people on a Bill founded on strictly parliamentary principles. Would it be unreasonable that we should ask the judgment of the people upon a Bill that has not a sound parliamentary principle in it from clause 1 to clause 6?—and it contains six clauses, all bad. Are we to blame? I think the Hon. Mr. Borden moved in 1910 that the Naval Bill be submitted also to the judgment of the people. Was he at fault in regard to the Naval Bill of 1910? If we take the Naval Bill of 1913 and submit it to the people, or propose that we should get the judgment of the people—are we to blame? I do not think so. I think Mr. Borden said in his speech at Montreal—I have not had time to look it up—that he would submit his Bill to parliament and if parliament rejected it he would appeal to the people. I have no concern whether he does or not. I have no concern with the political side of the question; but I have this concern, that I do sincerely hope that any legislation we may approve of in this House is in harmony with public opinion, whether that public opinion is represented in the other House by a Liberal or Conservative government.

Hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

### **Public Opinion.**

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex): The moment a Bill comes before us in regard to which public opinion is uncertain, or in regard