

formal matter, and we should not under those circumstances offer any amendment, although we may differ entirely from the policy of the Government. We have to thank His Excellency for the completion of the census, and certainly it is satisfactory to have some assurance at last on that subject. I hope that we will soon be able to make a comparison with the last census in all particulars. Indeed I would like to see some means adopted for taking the census more frequently as respects certain points. When we asked for a delay to consider the Address, it was not through any want of courtesy towards His Excellency. I think it was in accordance with the usage of this House, and I felt some parties with whom I had been speaking were anxious to obtain more information on certain points; and that information, I may add, I have received. I must say that the mover of the Address has proved himself a careful supporter of the Government. I believe him to be one who honors his seat, but at the same time I cannot help feeling that the Government in filling up the recent vacancies have acted contrary to the principle laid down at the time of Confederation. We are now creating a sort of impediment to future Governments when we fill up the Senate with gentlemen all holding one set of political opinions. We had pledges from Sir Etienne Tache, the present Premier, and the Post Master General himself, that a different rule would be observed, and it was carried out in 1867. I have no doubt that both the gentlemen who spoke on the address will be ornaments to the Senate, but I ask the Government whether they are acting fairly with political parties in making their Senatorial appointments from their own friends solely. It may be said that gentlemen, when they come into this House are expected to divest themselves of party feeling to a large extent, but we all know humanity is very weak.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend has on this occasion, as on others, taken that course which is highly creditable to him as the leader of Her Majesty's Opposition in this House. Certainly it is very desirable that the House should consider the reply to Address in the spirit in which the hon. gentleman has considered it on the present occasion. These answers are expressions more of courtesy than anything else, and the desire of both parties is to reply respectfully to the address from His Excellency. I cordially compliment my hon. friend who has moved the answer, as well as the hon. gentleman who has seconded it. It is a matter of plea-

sure that we have added to this body gentlemen so thoroughly qualified in every way. With respect to the remarks which fell from the hon. gentleman opposite as to the manner in which the appointments to the Senate are to be made, I am not aware how far he is correct. It was certainly said at the time of Confederation that due consideration would be shown to the two political parties in the selection of members to the Senate, and that promise was carried out. I am not aware—it will be, however, a matter of duty to ascertain the fact—that there was any promise that the same principle would be adopted in the future selection.

Hon. Mr. LOCKE—It was carried out in the original selection from the Maritime Provinces.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—In England the practice of a Conservative Ministry is to appoint Peers from their own party, and the same be said of the Whigs.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—Is not this a coalition Government?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Whenever there is a Coalition Government, of course they will appoint members from both parties, I would, however, like to know whether there was any such pledge given, as the hon. member for Grandville intimates, and I shall therefore enquire into the subject. The original compact was certainly carried out in the case of the different Provinces. I can only add in conclusion my deep sense of gratification at the manner in which this address has been received by gentlemen on the opposite side.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE—My hon. friend opposite has already spoken so well on this subject that it is not my intention to offer any lengthy remarks. It is an understood custom—one entirely in accordance with British usage—that whenever there are no objectionable passages in the Speech from the Throne, the answer should be allowed to pass without any discussion of a political aspect. I simply wish to say, apart from the matter of the Speech, that I regret in common with a great many others, that the Government have not called Parliament together at an earlier period. Last year it was very late—that was said to be due to the request of the Home Government at a time when the Washington Treaty was under discussion. We have not heard of any reason however, why Parliament should have been delayed this year to the fifth of March. It is notoriously a matter of great inconvenience, and in fact positive loss, to many of us, when we are delayed here into May. Of course a member of