

if it were true in the past that no Irish need apply in regard to the position of Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, we have now our champions in the ministry who will see that that barrier shall be thrown down, and that the fact of an Irishman being an Irishman shall be no reason why he should not occupy the position of Lieutenant-Governor. I am perfectly sure that the hon. the Solicitor-General, as well as the hon. gentleman who has long been recognized as a champion of Irish rights in this country, the present Secretary of State, will see that it shall not be because an Irishman is an Irishman that he shall not have his ambition satisfied if it be in the direction of the post of Lieutenant-Governor—of course, provided he has the other qualifications which are necessary. I hope this little domestic trouble, if it exists, will be soon removed, and that it will not be said in that province more than in any other that a man because he has the accident of Irish birth shall not have the office which his talents, his services to the country, and other qualities which I might enumerate, entitle him to occupy. Then my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Hearn) has shown a great deal of indignation, which no doubt was aroused by a remark of the Postmaster-General, when he said that an Administration existed in the province of Quebec a short time ago which disgraced that province. Assuredly there is not a member in this House who knows better than the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Hearn) the history of the different Administrations which have existed in that province. Did he express indignation in the past when it was established by fact proved, when it was established by the verdict of the people that Administrations composed of men of his own political creed had disgraced the province of Quebec? No. He crossed his arms and bowed his head in approval of all they did, because they were of his own political faith. To-day he is indignant, and says: Why attack this powerful Minister of Agriculture when he is not in this House? Whose is the fault that he is not in this House? I have not far to look to find an hon. member—I think the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette)—who threw out the challenge to the Minister of Agriculture, and said: I will resign my seat if he is willing to contest the seat with me, and to see if the people of that county will approve of his course as Governor of the province of Quebec. Did he accept that challenge? No, he refused to accept the challenge. Sir, the county of L'Islet was opened some time ago, and the Lieutenant-Governor had, as is well known the offer by his party to contest that county. Did he accept it? Sir, we did not keep the hon. Minister of Agriculture out of this House; it is not the hon. gentlemen on this side who closed these doors against him. It was his own knowledge of the feelings of the people of the province of Quebec. He knew that he could not face them, he dared not face them, with the knowledge of what he

had done as Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec. That is the reason why the hon. gentleman is not here. Anyway, it was not necessary to bring under the knowledge of the House the facts which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. He says that the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec received the approbation of the people, that when his ministry went before the people they received the sanction of the province. Let me recall another little matter of history to that hon. gentleman. There was another Lieutenant-Governor who some years ago presided over the destinies of the province of Quebec. For an act somewhat similar in nature, his ministry went before the people in the province of Quebec, and by the verdict of the people the Lieutenant-Governor was sustained. What did hon. gentlemen opposite do with him? They dismissed him. But did they dismiss Lieutenant-Governor Angers? Not at all. Sir, the Minister of Public Works threw out the hint a moment ago, when he said: "Why did you not bring his conduct under the notice of the House?" As much as to say: You know what we would have done had you brought it under the notice of the House. We would have voted it down, as we vote down anything and everything that you may bring up in this House. He referred to the gentleman who was dismissed from office. Let me here say that it is not my duty, it is not a part of my office, the circumstances of the case do not require, that I should defend the Hon. Mr. Mercier. But, Sir, these gentlemen attacked him, they dragged him before the court, they constituted the court, they named their own judge, they named their own jurymen, they put the case in every way just as they pleased. But their victim had a warm place in the hearts and in the affections of his countrymen in the province of Quebec. They dragged him into a criminal court. What was the result? Why, Sir, the whole country and the world know that their own judge and jury proclaimed their victim innocent. I can say that there are two names to-day well known in the province of Quebec, Mercier and Angers, and the day will come when the man who to-day has his reward in the Senate will regret the act which he has committed, and the other will be taken up as he was before, the choice of the people, and placed in the position he formerly held.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that while I am not going to raise any objection to the very unusual course which he has taken of proceeding into Supply within a few hours after the Estimates have been placed in our hands, I think he must remember in that case that we require a good deal more information than might otherwise be required. It is not at all convenient that the Estimates should be examined and proceeded with the day after they have been intro-