

began leaders could be brought together, to find out what was really going to be the acute form of the attack, or what was going to be the attacking point of the debate, and avoid that by settling matters beforehand, no doubt things would go much more easily. But you cannot do that by Act of Parliament or by any committee. These things must regulate themselves. I sometimes think the only cure for our long sessions, rests with the good sense of the House of Commons, the sufferings which they endure by prolonged sessions, and the objection which public opinion through the press and constituencies may make to it. I do not like exactly the idea of the Senate saying to the House of Commons 'You should do business in a certain way,' abolish 'Hansard' or cut down the speeches, or that members of the House of Commons should do this or that. I do not think any advice on that score would be taken in the spirit in which we would give it. If I thought they were open to conviction, that they might regard this body as wise because of its years, and accept advice from us, than a committee like that suggested would be very useful, and our section of the committee would give advice to the members of the House of Commons which, I think, would be profitable to them, and profitable to the country at large.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—There was one remark made by the hon. gentleman from Halifax with which I fully agree, and that is that this House has talked a great deal too much about itself and about Senate reform during the present session. We have had a number of motions on the subject, and we have had a number of gentlemen making speeches on what they were pleased to call Senate reform—two or three long speeches each on that subject. I think the subject was very fully discussed two years ago in the House. We had a very long and elaborate discussion on the question, and I consider that the Senate had stretched forth its hand and answered for itself, and it might allow that question to stand and not be supplemented by a number of debates during the present session. While that was to be deprecated, I think the present debate is more to be de-

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)

precated. It has been entirely a criticism of the House of Commons from beginning to end, and I do not think there is one hon. gentleman who has not transgressed the rules by criticising the procedure in the Commons and mapping out methods by which it could do business better than it is being done. It is not to be wondered at that we should have an irregular discussion, because the motion itself is irregular. It is irregular in one respect, as was pointed out, at a former stage of the placing of notice, inasmuch as there are two distinct propositions, which have no connection with each other, involved in the same motion. But apart from that, the latter part of the motion is irregular, and I think it is out of order:

That the Senate deems it expedient to invite the House of Commons to co-operate with it by means of a joint committee to consider the advisability of devising methods whereby a more equal division of the initiation of private and public legislation may be secured between the two branches of parliament, and adopting rules governing debate which will limit the time of discussion so as to better expedite business.

The hon. gentleman from Wellington, in this motion, has not stated where he proposes to apply these rules governing debate. It might be, for all I know, in the council of the town of Mount Forest, or in the municipality of Wellington. I do not think we would have very much to do with that here; nevertheless as far as the motion is concerned, it might apply to any of these places. It might apply, and my first conclusion was it would apply to this House; but I understood my hon. friend to say, and I certainly understood a number of other hon. gentlemen who addressed the House, that there does not appear to be any necessity for closure or anything like that here, for the general complaint perhaps not in the last year or two, but the general complaint against this House is that there have not been sufficient debates—not that there were too many. The only inference to be drawn—still it is only an inference—is that this House suggests the adoption of rules governing debate which will limit the time of discussion so as 'to better expedite business,' applies to the House of Commons, and if it does so apply it, it is irregular and out of order, and something