

against the spirit of the Constitution. Both languages are declared to be on the same footing; consequently the Chair should be occupied alternately by gentlemen of each nationality. Such is the spirit of the Constitution, or I do not understand what it means. The argument may not be so strong, so self-evident as it is in the case of a Minister, but it seems plain that if both languages are to be on the same footing, both being official, the Speakership should be held alternately. And not only so, but there was an arrangement at the time of Confederation, and if I am not mistaken that arrangement was acknowledged last year, and a tacit promise made that a gentleman of French origin would occupy the Chair either in this House or the other, and I hope that it will be carried out. I have, indeed, some pretty good reasons for believing that, with regard to the other House, the present occupancy is only for one year, that at the end of that time the gentleman now holding the position will be promoted, and that then a gentleman of French origin will take his place. Trusting that this will occur, I will not complain, as I desire to help the Government. I claim the right, but even in the way of such rights there are difficulties, I know, and a Prime Minister may sometimes be forced to disregard such rights under special exigencies for a short time, and I will then always be ready to help him and excuse him. The Hon. Minister of Justice said two years ago, and repeated it this year, that it is not the fault of the Government, but the fault of the French members of the Commons if there is not a French member occupying one of the Treasury benches. Then I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he means to say that it will be the duty of us, the French Senators representing Quebec, at the next general election, to help the Liberals in turning out those men who do not seem to care much about the rights of their Province? If he does, I am ready for the fight. We began it last summer, and we were prettysuccessful. We might continue it. I say we have a right to take that course, and, unless the people are incapable of understanding what is in their own interest, and in the interest of their own Province, they will sustain us in the conflict. Every member of this House is represented in the other House,

and if the hon. members representing Montreal East, Jacques Cartier, Laval, Hochelaga, or any other county in our province believe that we should have no French Minister in this House, I should think that they ought to be opposed, and that the electors of our Province will be equal to the position. It is rumoured that Mr. Chapleau, having retired from Quebec after the ruin of that Province, and having been taken under the care and protection of the Prime Minister of Canada, has gained something more even than that. If rumour is correct he has promised Mr. Mousseau a seat on the Bench whenever he has finished the dirty work he was left to do in Quebec. I do not know whether that is true or not. I do not know whether the appointment has been made, but if it is the case I must say that it is most discreditable. Mr. Mousseau's election of last year was contested; he was accused of having used the public money to buy hotel-keepers in Jacques Cartier county. His election was contested and he paid his opponent the sum of \$5000 to avoid exposure. When the new election took place his opponent would have gained the day by 200 or 300 votes had not Mr. Mousseau been elected at an expense of thousands of dollars. That election is now being contested on account of personal corruption, and I do not see how any Government in the world could honorably appoint a man in such a position to the bench. It is said that efforts are now being made to buy his opponents off again, so that he may get clear of the punishment which the law provides. Now, Mr. Mousseau is a friend of mine.

HON. MR. PLUMB—He seems to be.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I will only answer the hon. gentleman that he and I perhaps do not view things in the same light. I put public morality before friendship, and it seems the hon. gentleman prefers his friends to public morality.

It being six o'clock HON. MR. BELLEROSE moved the adjournment of the debate.

The Senate adjourned at 6 p.m.