

which he is an ornament, make more money than any office would give him in the gift of any government.

I must say a few words with regard to the attitude of this House last session in reference to these important Bills. I do not think this House was open to any censure whatever in passing these Bills. We have the power here to reject money Bills; we have not the power to amend them. But I think it would be difficult to find any precedent either in England or in any of the self-governing colonies where any upper House rejected a money Bill coming to it with the unanimous consent of both parties in the money voting branch; and these Bills came up to this House with the unanimous consent of the House of Commons. I think it would have been an unprecedented thing to reject these Bills under the circumstances, and therefore not the slightest blame can attach to the Senate for its action on that occasion.

Proud as I am of the traditions and achievements of the Liberal Conservative party of Canada, in which it has been my privilege for so many years to claim an humble share, I think I shall be found in the future as in the past generally voting—at least I hope so, in support of the policy and measures of that party, but I do not wish on these occasions that my conduct should be taken to indicate any change of mind on my part in regard to the present leadership of the opposition.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—I desire to offer a few observations, and I shall be very brief. I do not know that I would have spoken had it not been for a statement I made at a public meeting in my riding which I have had the honour of representing for eighteen years; it was carried into the public press and in justice to myself I cannot allow the statement that has been made in this House on this occasion to go unchallenged, as far as I am concerned. At that meeting I said that the Indemnity Bill and the Bill granting an allowance to ex-ministers was rushed through this House at a moment when the Governor General was in the building prepared to prorogue parliament and the guard of honour was before the door. That I still maintain. My memory serves me very badly if I am not correct in making that statement. In jus-

tice to this Chamber as a deliberative body a reasonable opportunity should be given to deal with important measures of this kind instead of rushing them through at a gallop, as I heard one hon. gentleman say, at the last moment of the session. The Secretary of State has said to-day that these Bills were discussed in caucus. For my part I can honestly say that I never heard of any caucus and I never heard from any member of the other House directly or indirectly the first suggestion with regard to the allowance to retired ministers. That question was not, to my recollection, discussed in any caucus of the ministerial party, nor was it made known to members of the other House. I have talked with several of them, and they say that they never heard a word about it. It was tacked on to the Indemnity Bill at the last moment, and carried through, and eventually made its appearance in this House. That the legislation was objectionable is beyond all question. People of Canada are not in favour of it and, if the government assumed the responsibility of keeping it on the statute-book, their supporters will have to meet it on every political platform when the next general election comes round. I was pleased to notice that the Hon. the Postmaster General, when he was fighting for the seat he now holds, stated that he would use all the influence at his command to secure, if not the abolition of that enactment, at least an amendment of it that would bring it more in accord with public opinion. I hope that that promise on the part of Mr. Aylesworth will be carried out, and that this clause will be abolished. For my own part I have always been opposed to superannuation to a retired cabinet minister. I think that any minister of the Crown can surely manage to live for the balance of his days, after retiring from office, without becoming a charge upon the treasury of this Dominion. I agree with my hon. friend who has just sat down, that if any gentleman who has discharged the onerous duties of the minister of the Crown finds, in the evening of his existence, that what he has to depend upon in the way of support is so very limited that he is not able to live upon it—that if the country will not do something for him he must either go to the poor house or become a pensioner on the bounty of his friends—in