

a Governor of the province of New Brunswick would be taken up immediately after the prorogation. Since that time several months have elapsed, and I understand that no such appointment has yet been made. I would ask the First Minister to now take the House into his confidence and to state what was the cause of the delay, and whether it is the policy of the Government to give third terms to the Provincial Governors or not? During the recess the press has very naturally discussed this matter, and many names have been referred to. The name of the respected Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of that province has been mentioned, and at one time it was thought, and generally believed, that the present Secretary of State had accepted the position, but I suppose we may understand by his accepting his present duties that he is not looking for it, at any rate for the time. We have also heard the name of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) mentioned, and we have heard that his appointment was pressed on the Government, and also, we have understood, that his fitness for that appointment was challenged by others very severely. Then the name of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Adams) has been mentioned, and favourably mentioned. Other names have also been referred to, one of a gentleman who was formerly a member of this House, who is looked upon as one of the Fathers of Confederation, and who would no doubt make a very popular Governor. No doubt these names are under the consideration of the Government of the day, but I think it is only fair, looking at the promise of the First Minister at the close of the last session, that he should state what reasons there are for the extraordinary delay in making the appointment. The present incumbent of the office has had two terms, and is now two years and some odd months on the third term. It is not right that such a state of things should continue. It would inaugurate a very bad system if it were understood that a third term might be given, and if the hon. gentleman cannot arrange the differences amongst those who support him as to who should be appointed, he might go outside and appoint either the Chief Justice or our old and esteemed fellow-member, Mr. Mitchell. However, whomsoever the Government may appoint is another matter, but the appointment of somebody is, I think, a necessity, and I think the cause of the delay should be explained.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume the hon. gentleman does not expect me to discuss the claims of the different gentlemen whose names have been put forward. The subject was brought to the notice of the House by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) towards the close of last session somewhat unexpectedly, and the line which the hon. gentleman's observations took, as I remember, was somewhat thus. The hon. gentle-

man challenged the constitutional propriety of allowing any time to elapse after the expiration of the term of a Lieutenant-Governor without the appointment of his successor. He seemed to think that it was a constitutional obligation on the Government to fill the office at once. The position then taken by the hon. member struck me at the time as being somewhat new, and, having been mentioned on the spur of the moment, I promised the hon. gentleman and the House that the subject would be taken up immediately after the close of the session. It was, and the conclusion which I arrived at was altogether different from the conclusion which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seemed to have arrived at. I humbly submit to the House, notwithstanding the opinion which he has expressed, that the constitutional position is this, that the Lieutenant-Governors hold office during the pleasure of the Crown, but are irremovable except for cause within the five year period, and that there is no such exigency as the hon. gentleman seemed to suppose in regard to filling the office. It was chiefly for that reason that the office was not filled by another incumbent, it being already occupied by a gentleman who was well able to fulfil the functions of the office. I may state that no decision has been come to in regard to conferring a third term, and I agree with the hon. member that in most cases that should be avoided. The office has remained without a new appointment for the reason that it is well filled now and that no reason for a new appointment has been shown.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The opinion I expressed last year I entertain still, that it is an irregular and unconstitutional proceeding to permit a Lieutenant-Governor to continue in the position which the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick occupies at the present time. The hon. gentleman has said that these appointments are made during the pleasure of the Crown. That is true of every Governor appointed in any part of the British Empire, but as a matter of fact they do not hold office longer than five years except for cause. The rule pursued by the Colonial Office is precisely that laid down in the British North America Act as to the Lieutenant-Governors of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman says that after five years have expired, the Government are under no obligation to immediately appoint a successor. Now, the hon. gentleman should see that the position of Lieutenant-Governor, after five years have expired, is altogether different from what his position was before that period expired. The hon. gentleman knows that after five years have expired, the Lieutenant-Governor can be removed without assigning any cause. Sir Leonard Tilley might be removed at the end of two years, he might be removed at the end of three, at the end of four, at the end of five, at the end of six. After the first period of five years have expired, then he holds office simply as a