

been in office except for cause shown. In many of those cases, so far as I remember, we thought it was preferable to hold an inquiry, departmental or otherwise, and we came to no determination in such cases. These reasons may have delayed the notification to some of those gentlemen who were appointed; but that was the only reason, and when the papers are brought down my hon. friend will find that these cases are very few indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. The one point in which my hon. friend really touched the motion that was introduced by the leader of the Opposition, was in the last two or three minutes of his remarks. There was no contention between my hon. friend and the leader of the Government as to all that class of names with regard to which His Excellency had withheld his recommendation, or his signature. The point of contest between my hon. friend and the leader of the Government was as to those whose recommendations were signed by the Governor General, and who were, consequently, de facto appointed to office. Now, what is the excuse of the hon. gentleman with reference to those? Some, he says, may be held over till the present time, he does not know how many, that will be shown when the papers come down. That is very true, and as to how many have had no information, or as to how many whose appointments have been annulled, we shall not know until the papers are brought down. But the hon. gentleman, to parry the force of the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that up to the present time there were appointed, and he knew of them who had not received any notification, good, bad or indifferent, brings in this excuse, that the Government found it impracticable to dismiss them any more than they would dismiss officers who had already entered upon their duties, because they were really officers, and had been so appointed by Order in Council; but it was thought better to make an inquiry into them, and that led to delay. Well, now, that is rather hard upon the Government. It is now nine or ten months since the Government took office. These gentlemen have been waiting, their appointments having been signed by the Governor General, and these appointments have been made public through statements made here on the floor of the House; and yet these gentlemen have been left for nine or ten months without even the courtesy of a communication by the Government. An investigation surely should not take so much time as that; surely an investigation having been undertaken by my hon. friend and having been carried out very summarily and the results having been apparent in very few weeks, not to say a few months, I do not think it was a sufficient excuse for my hon. friend to state that inquiry was necessary when nine months had elapsed,

and these gentlemen have received no word in any way with reference to their appointment. However, with reference to that, my hon. friend has covered the ground, and when the papers are brought down we shall know the exact state of the case. But my hon. friend the leader of the Government is singularly unfortunate in the other position he took with reference to the argument of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. He endeavoured gravely to argue before this House that the principle involved in the late election in Nova Scotia was the same as that which was affirmed by Sir Charles Tupper when he was in opposition in Nova Scotia, in 1859. In the latter case the preceding legislature had passed a law stating that persons holding offices under the Crown were disqualified for sitting as members of Parliament. An election was held, and when the election was over it came to pass that the Government of the preceding period was in a minority, that amongst the majority there were at least five or six who were elected as members, but who were disqualified by the very Act which had been passed by that legislature precedent to the election, and that, therefore, they could not sit if the law was to have the force of law at all, that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council at the time asked the Colonial Office for instruction, and the Colonial Office asked the law officers of the Crown for an opinion. The opinion of the law officers for the Crown was that those men ought not to be considered as members of Parliament, and that a Government ought not to be carried on with a majority, the prevailing part of whom were persons who had been elected in direct opposition to the statute law which disqualified them from being members of that legislature. What was the principle involved? The principle involved was the independence of Parliament, and my hon. friend tried to argue that in the province of Nova Scotia the principle of the independence of Parliament respecting a law of the legislature, had no life left there because, in the election which was held a month ago, Mr. Murray was victorious and the Liberal-Conservatives in that legislature were defeated. That was the argument, if there was any argument. It needs but to be stated to the House to show how far afield my hon. friend went in order to support a bad position. Well, Sir, my hon. friend is even more unfortunate in the second position. He asks if there is any reason at all why an arrangement carried out on the appointment of the first Senate of Canada should not be carried out all the way through. The arrangement at that time was that the first Senate should be made up of representatives of both parties, in equal or nearly equal numbers, and the hon. gentleman maintains that, therefore, this should follow as the rule under confederation, and so long as this country exists under a constitutional government. Now, Sir, who were the appoint-