

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, he receives an addition to his indemnity.

Hon. Mr. THIBAudeau (de la Vallière) reported the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

The House did not rise until the following day, the 20th, so the Bill was brought down two days before the House prorogued. I made the observation that I understood the Bill had been discussed in caucus. I was not present at any caucus, and I may be wrong, and I will withdraw that statement; but what I did understand was that a round robin had been signed in the other House, by both sides, for the increased indemnity.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—When I heard the hon member from Richmond addressing the House, I began to ask myself the question, 'Has Sir Wilfrid Laurier resigned, and has Mr. R. L. Borden been called to form a government, and is he at this moment conducting the affairs of the Dominion?' because my hon. friend who is an eminent constitutional authority must know that constitutionally the government of the day is responsible for legislation brought down and carried through parliament, and any charges he has to make should be directed against the government of the day and not against the leader of the opposition. I generally listen with great pleasure to the hon. gentleman from Richmond (Mr. Miller) and very generally it has been my pleasure to agree with the views, which he so eloquently places before the Senate; but I must on the present occasion dissent very emphatically from his conclusions. I understood him at the outset to say that he had lost confidence in the leader of the Conservative party in Canada, on account of some things which had occurred last session, on account of a power which he said had been allowed to dominate the Liberal Conservative party since Mr. Borden had become its leader. My hon. friend did not elucidate that point any further, so I am not quite clear as to what he meant. I assume the reference was to a section of the Conservative party who took very extreme ground with regard to separate schools last session.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—No.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—At all events my hon. friend did not proceed to explain

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

what he meant by some power or influence which had dominated the leader of the Conservative party.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—I think I clearly indicated that I meant the Hon. Geo. E. Foster.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I understood that a later reference was to Mr. Foster. I was going to point out that no later than last year my hon. friend, in a letter which he read in this House, and which appears in the Debates, warmly supported Mr. Borden's views on the great question then before the country, and he went still further to say that the argument which that hon. gentleman had addressed to the House of Commons on the Autonomy Bills, had never been answered and was simply unanswerable.

We will pass that part of the question and reach another part of it, on which my hon. friend laid very great stress, and which he elaborated at very considerable length; that is the voting of an allowance to the leader of the opposition, which my hon. friend has denounced in the very strongest terms. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in his denunciation of that proposition. In my humble opinion it is the first time in the history of confederation when that question has been dealt with honestly by the political parties of Canada. Since confederation both parties have been compelled to make provision for the leader of the opposition for the time being and means have been resorted to which were not by any means as free from objection as the course pursued last year. For what was done last session Sir Wilfrid Laurier must get the credit and must take the blame, if any attaches. Mr. Borden is no more responsible for that legislation, than any other member who voted for it. When Sir John Macdonald, the greatest man that Canada has ever produced, was leading the opposition in the House of Commons he was not a rich man, and his friends subscribed a very considerable sum of money as a gift to Lady Macdonald in order that Sir John might be able to give his time and services unreservedly to the people of Canada. I was a close student of Canadian politics at that time, and I remember very well that the Toronto 'Globe' ably supported by my hon. friend the