

gentleman has found, by experience, that it is impossible to carry that out; but that he must have regard to the deserved eminence and pre-eminence of hon. gentlemen from different Provinces, and give to each in proportion to its capabilities of supplying strength to the Administration from those public men who are in his ranks at the time. The hon. gentleman did not tell us exactly when the Hon. Mr. Smith was called to the Cabinet without a portfolio, nor did he tell us exactly why; nor did he communicate to us—what I think upon this occasion, if he had been disposed to deal with us in a spirit of generosity and liberality and not confine himself as far as possible within the letter of the rule,—why Senator O'Donohue was not called to the Cabinet. I think his explanation might have been added, and the story without them is extremely incomplete; but I suppose, after what the hon. gentleman has said, we must be thankful for what we have got, and not expect anything more; and, as the hon. gentleman's constitutional principle as to the formation of Cabinets has been violated, as what my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec understood was the well settled and reasonable rule on this subject has also been violated, and as the hon. gentleman's constitutional principles as to Ministers in the Cabinets without portfolios have also been violated, and all by himself, I leave to you his explanations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to close the discussion with my hon. friend in the same kindly spirit with which he has opened it. However, he is mistaken in stating that on the formation of the first Administration in 1867 we laid down any cast-iron rules. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman will honor me so far as to go back to the Debates of that occasion. I said that that principle could not be carried out, that the object of uniting the Provinces was to have one great Dominion, and that the principle of having sectional representation could not be carried out, and could not be adopted as a final principle of the Constitution. I said, however, that as we were forming a new Confederation, as each Province was returning a certain number of members, and was naturally very anxious as to its position in the Confederation, and that as we had to take the initiation in the formation of the first Government, we thought proper, in order to prevent any injurious suspicions, and in order to bring in from every section full support in the principle of Confederation, so to distribute the offices in the Cabinet as to give each Province a representation; and we did so, giving the Province of Ontario five members, Quebec four, and the other two Provinces two each. I took also the precaution of stating at that time that this kind of thing could not be expected to go on forever, but that it was absolutely requisite in order to start fair—if I may use the expression—to commence auspiciously, that every Province should feel that it had a proportionate representation in the Cabinet; but that in the future that could not be the case. I pointed out that we hoped that Confederation would extend over the whole of this continent, and that there would be very many other Provinces entering Confederation in the future, and that therefore this arrangement was a temporary one and could not continue, and that with the addition of a large number of Provinces it would be impossible in the by-and-bye for every Province to be represented in the Cabinet, and that eventually we would be obliged to adopt the system in vogue in the United States, where they have only, I think, seven Cabinet Ministers; but they choose one from the New England States, one from the Southern States, one from the Western States, and so on, dividing the whole United States into groups, and having each group represented in the Cabinet. That must be the case in Canada where we shall have many more Provinces in the lifetime of my hon. friend who leads the Opposition. With the changing circumstances of the country, with the formation of new Provinces, and the pressure of new interests upon

Mr. BLAKE.

Parliament, there must be continual changes and adaptations of the working of our Parliamentary system to the varying developments of this country. That was the principle I laid down, and I have never abandoned it. My hon. friend says that Ontario is given an undue preponderance.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He throws it out. Well, so far as that is concerned, I take it that there are two members in the Government who are summoned as members of the Privy Council, who are summoned to attend meetings of the Cabinet—the Speaker of the Upper House and the Hon. Frank Smith. The Speaker of the Upper House receives no salary, in the first place, for acting as he does in the Ministry.

Mr. BLAKE. The country wants no gratuitous services.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But he has done this, and I personally am exceedingly grateful for it; he has taken from my shoulders an enormous amount of work connected with the North-West, arising from the unexpected development of that country, and I was only too glad to accept the assistance and service, the able assistance and service, of my hon. friend the Speaker of the Upper House to aid me as Minister of the Interior. He has come to my assistance as a personal friend, as a gentleman having full confidence in myself as I have in him; he has done yeoman service for me and for the country by bringing a practical and business mind, unwearied perseverance and great ability, to aid me in the enormous task of dealing with the various questions that have arisen with respect to the North-West. So that Mr. Macpherson has really come to my aid, and the country has received the benefit of his gratuitous services as a member of the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman also spoke about Mr. Smith coming into the Cabinet, and he said I was wrong either on a past occasion or now. I was not wrong either time. Mr. Frank Smith has been summoned to the Cabinet, and I am very glad to get his assistance and advice; but he stood in quite a different position from my hon. friend opposite. My hon. friend opposite was the power behind the Throne; he was the Government; he was like the centurion, a man in authority: he said to a man, go, and he goeth; and to another, come, and he cometh; and in the eyes of the country and of his own party, and in the eyes of every one who could see how things were going, he was really the Prime Minister, but without responsibility of any kind. And the hon. gentleman was not only Prime Minister of the Dominion, but Premier of Ontario as well, in both cases without portfolio, he having the power and ability to direct affairs, that great ability and intellectual superiority having been acknowledged by his party and the country by his selection for the high and important position which he now holds; and as he was pulling the strings and guiding the party of his own Province and of the Dominion, of which that Province is a part, he ought to have taken the position and assumed the responsibility, and not have been able to say "that was not my measure." The hon. gentleman has done that on many occasions. He has said: "I was not in the Ministry at that time." We all know that; but it is the old case of Stephano and Trinculo, "Thou shalt be king, and I will be viceroy over thee." He pulled the strings and governed the country, and he committed a great breach of the constitutional principle, that power and authority should go together. My hon. friend Mr. Frank Smith held no such position. He is a gentleman who has made a fortune in his own way, and is recognized in the country as a representative Irishman and Irish Roman Catholic. He also draws no salary; he is not feeding at the public crib any more than did my hon. friend opposite, who, whatever may be his political faults, is not a man who will throw himself into an assumed