

session which promises to cover nearly a whole year, and the other House is not at the present time in that calm and equable frame of mind which the hon. leader of the opposition thinks it ought to be in, and which it should be in, in order to deal with a resolution such as that submitted by the hon. gentleman from Wellington. I noticed that both the hon. leader of the opposition and the right Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce deprecated the introduction of the closure. There has been no hurry in introducing the closure here, but the closure was found necessary in England with a view to enabling the public business to be transacted, and until the change of heart which the hon. leader of the opposition seems to foresee takes place in the members of the House of Commons, it will be found that we cannot get through with the public business in that House, without resorting to the closure. They have the same thing in the United States, and in the various state legislatures of the republic. They do not call it closure, but it is the previous question, and the question is put in exactly the same words as in the Commons in England, that the question be now put, and the majority have some power of protecting themselves. In this country, so far as parliament is concerned, the minority rule, and I do not think that the way in which the minority have ruled for the last few years makes it desirable that they should be allowed to rule parliament any longer. I do not see why we should undertake to talk about adopting rules governing debate which will limit the time of discussion so as to better expedite business. The Senate is never responsible for prolonging a session. We do not need any rules to shorten our debates, as we are at present constituted at any rate. The other House would naturally resent any attempt on the part of the Senate to tell them that they were not conducting their business in the proper way. It is not for us to tell them how they should conduct their business. As citizens of Canada, we may make observations on the length of the session, but we have no right as one House to try to advise the other House how it should transact its internal business. No

sort of rearrangement of the present division of business between the two Houses will shorten the session. The root of the matter is in the House of Commons, and if that House can be induced either to adopt some rule which will prevent these everlasting discussions, or if the members of the two sides will meet together in that spirit of Christian brotherhood, which the hon. leader of the opposition seems to think should prevail, you may get something done; but no action we can take here will materially affect the question. We have discussed ourselves too much this session. We have talked about the constitution of the Senate and how it could be improved, how our business should be transacted, and various other things, and now we propose to discuss our relations with the House of Commons. I think that our relations with the other House at the present time are perfectly satisfactory, to us at any rate. Whenever they do send us a legislative measure we give it our best consideration, and we amend a very considerable number of the measures they send up. That constitutes about the only relation between the two Houses that we need concern ourselves about. When the other House adopts a better method of transacting the public business, and there is some possibility of confining the sessions of parliament within reasonable limits, then if the hon. senator from North Wellington introduces a measure to further improve the situation, I shall be happy to support him, but at the present time I do not think this motion is opportune.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—This is a question, as has been intimated by the hon. senator from British Columbia, that has been discussed in this House for a great many years. Scarcely a session passes without our devoting some time to finding fault with the progress of public business. I am very much inclined to agree with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, particularly on the subject of continuing 'Hansard.' Like himself, I was in favour of the abolition of it when I sat in the House of Commons, whenever the question came up, and I think he was actuated by the same feeling, that the use