

whether under our system it would be fair and right to extend the power of the opposition leader. I do not approve of what has been recently done, making the leader of the opposition a paid officer of the state. It is not a direction along which we should develop our system of administration. I know that the Premier has said that he recognized it as a new stage in the development of constitutional government, and Mr. Fielding, in some observations which he made, used almost the identical words, saying it was evidence of the development of our system of responsible government; but, as the opposition leader is not responsible to the majority of the people, it is hard to see why he should have such power, and, further than that, as the hon. member from Richmond argued, if it be correct to allow the leader of the opposition to perform executive work of that kind, he might just as well become a member of the government, and the whole matter of responsible administration might cease; but it could not cease because, after all, the government of the day must be responsible for the appointments which are made. Dividing power with the leader of the opposition would seem to be division of authority for which there would be not only no warrant, but which must lead to a complete confusion in the government of the country along the lines which we have adopted.

However, there was a very general agreement that the reform of the Senate is needed. The hon. gentleman from Richmond (Hon. Mr. Miller) whose experience goes back over the whole history of our country from the time of confederation, held that the nominated Chamber was a failure. The hon. gentleman from Marshfield (Hon. Mr. Ferguson) concurred in that to the extent of declaring in favour of a new mode of appointment. The hon. gentleman from Wolseley (Hon. Mr. Perley) took the ground that the Senate could not be independent and must be partisan. I regret the hon. senator is not in the House at present, as I wished to make one observation with regard to the address which he made. He rang the changes very strongly in his beautiful and harmonious voice, on the fact that the government had not filled certain vacancies in New Brunswick and persist-

ently referred to the fact that the city of St. John was not represented here. I appreciated the compliment which the hon. gentleman paid me by forgetting me entirely; but that statement and also the statement which the hon. gentleman made, that in the early days of confederation a much better Senate was appointed than is appointed now and that in fact all religions, all classes, and all conditions of men were represented, were scarcely in accordance with the facts. I do not wish to bring up any reference to old sores. I have nothing to say in regard to gerrymanders and things of that kind; but I would like to remind the Senate, because, no doubt, the members know it, that when the first senators were called from the province of New Brunswick there was not a single Roman Catholic called among the number, so that while the hon. gentleman was, no doubt, correct so far as the other provinces were concerned he was quite inexact as far as New Brunswick was concerned. Further than that, the hon. gentleman stated that all parties were represented. I would say that the party to which I and a number of the residents of New Brunswick happen to belong was not represented in the Senate, for quite a long time. It is quite true there was a break up of parties which unhinged matters somewhat, and while it would be fair to say that there were both Conservatives and Liberals called from New Brunswick, it would be correct also to say that the opposition in New Brunswick was not represented in the Senate at first. There are two principal grounds upon which the idea of a Senate is upheld. One of them is the revision of the parliamentary work of the Lower House, and the other the representation of the provinces—that is to say, that there shall be a certain number of senators from each of the provinces, and that by this means the safety of the smaller provinces in the confederation is secured. I was very much amused at an illustration which my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Ferguson) used during the course of his observations and at the summary which he made of the various questions which have come before the Senate in which the Senate had saved the rights of the provinces. My hon. friend selected from among the number a vote