

that are here, and who gave this Senate as I say, a character, established it in this country, made it a portion of the parliamentary history of the country, were the glory of this Senate, and it is regrettable to see them passing away as fast as they are. But there is one little objection that might perhaps come up in reference to this point, and it is this; that under the late Conservative regime the Liberal members were pretty nearly wiped out. I think there were only ten or eleven left. At the present time our Conservative friends are passing away and that makes the balance of power probably too weak on their side. I admit that. That is one argument which might be advanced in reference to the elective system. It would maintain the balance of power in the Senate; at the same time I do not think there is any particular harm going to result from any party dwindling down to a small number. As long as there are a dozen or two dozen of good representatives on either side they can put forward the ideas the opposition represent, as strongly probably as if there were three dozen. Our friends are now 33. They could afford to be reduced to half that number, and I believe their views would be just as forcibly advanced in this Senate as it is at the present time. They could criticise measures, oppose measures and agree with measures just as strongly as an opposition of fifteen or twenty as they do at the present time. Under those conditions, not wishing to weary the House, I think it would be wisdom on our part to retain the Senate just as it is at the present time; to hold to our present mode of appointment to the Senate, to give credit to the fathers of confederation who formed the constitution of the Senate, who granted it its powers, and in my opinion I do not believe we can amend it in any regard. I think, therefore, that we should pay no attention whatever to the flippant and ungenerous remarks, such as we see in a newspaper published in Toronto the other day, made by men who know little or nothing of the character of the Senate. I am pleased to see that another paper, which I consider far ahead of the Toronto 'News', namely the Montreal 'Gazette', advises the House of Commons to stop talking and do their work, or else go home and let the

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON.

Senate do the work, as they do it better than the House of Commons. Under these circumstances, my idea is to pay no attention to the flippant remarks made by members of the House of Commons and by some newspapers whose editors know very little about what they are discussing.

An important point which appears to have been overlooked in this debate is the importance and value of the example of the Senate, not merely upon the parliamentary life and practice of Canada, but upon Canadian society at large.

Any one who follows the procedure in this House must admit, and many who do not so follow it admit, that as compared with any other legislative body on the continent of America, the Senate is a very model of parliamentary decency and order. And one of the proudest boasts a Canadian can make to-day is that this country, governed as it is as nearly as may be after the unequalled British model—a form of government which combines the maximum of personal liberty with the maximum of law, order and personal safety—stands on this continent as the champion of well ordered liberty as opposed to all ill-considered license which but too often acts as a cloak for excess and lawlessness.

This honourable House is the acknowledged custodian and authoritative exponent of the ancient, distinctly dignified, and wisely devised forms and stately ceremonials of British parliamentary practice, the scrupulous preservation of which, there can be no doubt, has had a valuable practical influence upon the satisfactory development of the parliamentary system of government in Canada. From its rigid and even jealous adhesion to established precedent, and its scrupulously strict observance of the more stately forms of procedure, the Senate of Canada stands as a model of sound parliamentary practice, and it has exercised, and still exercises an important and benign influence upon the whole parliamentary body in this Dominion.

This House, by reason of its component parts, is naturally a staid and cautious body. It stands unflinchingly for what has been proved by the unerring test of time to be wholesome and beneficial, as against any rash and hasty theories which are bound to be evolved in a young, vigorous and enterprising community such as ours.