that is, he will have the best communication the physical circumstances will admit of between the inland and the mainland. That is what we are anxious to carry out. was entrusted by the Premier with completing the Quebec section of the Government, that this gentleman, believing (I am bound to suppose) that he knew better,

[FEB. 13, 1883.]

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE-You should begin the Island Branch!

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Since my hon. friend spoke, I sent a message to the Department about the Island Branch, but no satisfactory reply has reached me; the reply does not touch the question. I ask when the Island Railway will be commenced and they reply "The work of construction is not yet commenced." Before the close of the Session I hope to be able to give my friend information on that point.

I am glad the speech from the throne has been received with so much unanimity and satisfaction by hon. gentlemen of both sides of the House; and I might even have thought that the hon. member who leads the Opposition (only for one or two of his remarks) was supporting the Government.

How. MR. BELLEROSE—Hon. Gentlemen,—No doubt you have been astonished at the extraordinary speech which the honorable Senator for the division of Mille Isles (Mr. Masson) has just delivered. But your. surprise at this first speech of his will cease when I tell you that he could do no better, since he was forced, by all possible means, to justify the course he had followed in October, 1878, when called upon by the honorable Premier to join his Government He had on that occasion refused to comply with the spirit of the Constitution.

After the British North America Act of 1867 had been adopted by the Imperial Parliament, the delegates to England, who had framed the new Constitution, had to Put it in operation and give some of the clauses of this important law, their true interpretation. How did they interpret the 133 clause and how did they carry it out? Did they not give both Houses of Did they not give both Houses of Parliament (the Senate and the Commons) ministers of the two nationalities recognized by the Constitution? Had not the Senate, as well as the Commons, its French ministers as well as its English speaking ministers? Yes, and it was only in 1878, when the Hon. Senator (Mr. Masson) joined the Administration and

pleting the Quebec section of the Government, that this gentleman, believing (I am bound to suppose) that he knew better, that he had more experience and more brains in his head than the old veteran, the late lamented Sir George Cartier, dropped the constitutional practice and refused to give the Senate a minister of French origin who could take part in the debates in the language of the minority, and so forced that minority to either speak a language which is not theirs (as has been the case during the last five years) or be told that they are not understood when they advocate in the French language the cause of the people they represent.

The hon. member for DeSalaberry, (Mr. Trudel), a few minutes ago shewed by the strongest logical arguments, our pretensions as to the right of the minority in this House to have a French Senator sitting on the Treasury Benches-and I may fairly challenge any gentleman, in or outside of this Senate, to controvert those arguments. Yet the hon. Senator from Mille Isles, (Mr. Masson), emphatically denies that such is the case, believing, it must be supposed, that a simple denial of his is worth all the arguments in the The hon. gentleman asks, have world. not the two hon. members who have advocated the use of the French language addressed themselves to this hon. House in the English language? No doubt, we have done so to-day, as we have done during the last five years, since we have been deprived by his unpatriotic act, of ministers in this Senate, who can understand and answer us in our language.

The hon. leader in this House, (Sir Alex Campbell), has stated that it had never been a rule that the Speakers of the two Houses should not belong to the same nationality, and the hon. gentleman gave as a proof of his assertion, that while the Senate was presided over by the hon. Mr. Christie, the Commons had as its Speaker, hon. Mr. Anglin. Again, that after hon. Mr. Chauveau had been appointed Speaker of the Senate, during the first Parliament after Confederation, hon. Mr. Cauchon was appointed Speaker of the Senate during the second Parliament; and also, that the French element, which numbered only one-fourth of the whole population, could not expect to receive