

him in the most open and best way he can to promote what he believes to be good for the country. Is there any man in England who takes a more active public part in influencing public elections than Lord Salisbury, going from one part of the British Islands to another to deal with the public questions of the day in a most vigorous and trenchant manner? In doing so he is no exception. It is well known that the most distinguished peers of the realm are in the habit of taking the most active part in influencing public opinion of their utterances both on the platform and in Parliament. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman had no right to raise that question. The hon. gentleman spoke of adjourning the Senate. It was adjourned for a time without any material hindrance to the progress of public business. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that in the Province of Ontario, his great exemplar, the person whose example he considers more important than any other, adjourned, I believe, the whole Parliament of Ontario for the purpose of taking part in the Dominion Elections of 1874. I think, under these circumstances, it is hardly worth while for the hon. gentleman to have made an onslaught on the Speaker of the Senate, and on the principle of Senators taking part in public elections, when the fact is notorious to the whole country that the hon. gentleman's friends in the Senate have used all the influence and power they possessed in the same direction and in the same way. Now, I want to say one word with reference to the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition as to this reform which he considers it the duty of the Government to bring about. I want to know why the hon. gentleman did not avail himself of the opportunity when he was in great distress, when his great difficulty was his unwillingness to belong to a Reform party who could find nothing to reform. The demand was as great as it is now, the Contingent Committee of the Senate bore as little reverence to the views of the Government of the day as they do now, there was as great a disparity between the salaries of the officers of the Senate down to the messengers, and the officers of this, as there is now; but the hon. gentleman's Government did not commit themselves, great as the necessity was, and did not undertake to put in practice what he now so strongly urges upon this Government to do. I imagine the difficulty would be precisely the same as would have met the hon. gentleman if the Government of my hon. friend who then led the Government, and who did not undertake it simply because he did not wish to bring about any conflict between the two Houses, which, after all, would be comparatively insignificant, if it was going at all to interfere with the harmonious working of the two branches of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. What I suggested to the hon. gentleman was, that in a body over which he had a greater control than he has even of this body, he should use that influence which he had from the fact that he has the political sympathy and support of the vast majority of this body, to introduce a reform in its administration similar to that which he was introducing here. The hon. Minister of Railways asks me why my hon. friend from East York—who never had a majority in the Senate, who never had control of that body, whose difficulty always was that one of the great legislative bodies of this country had been created by his adversaries—why he did not make use of the advantages which he did not possess, to do what I suggested to the hon. gentleman, that, under entirely different circumstances he should do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, if the hon. gentleman opposite did not succeed in his measures, neither did he try. He should have tried. The responsibility of not trying rests upon his Government; and if his measure, through his influence in the Lower House, was carried and presented to the Upper House, and was then thrown out, then the responsibility of throwing it out rested on the Upper House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman suggest that such a measure as that should not have been introduced into the Lower House, but in the Senate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The expenditure of public money is completely in control of this House, as much as it is in the other—there is not the slightest doubt about that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows very well that such a measure as the one alluded to could only be carried by a Government having control of the Senate. The hon. gentleman himself, and any other hon. member of this House, would have denounced a Government for introducing a measure of that kind without first having it introduced in the Senate. Besides, we have abundant opportunity of knowing that, from the first, there was not a measure passed without evincing the hostility the Senate bore to the Government. It constituted itself into a political convention for the prosecution of Ministers for the time being. It was their entire occupation, for several Sessions, holding Committee meetings, sending abroad documents calculated to deceive, to one of which the hon. Minister of Railways has alluded, a pamphlet full of false statements—and flagrant and fraudulent statements. The hon. gentleman will remember, no doubt, that there was a second pamphlet issued to influence the Ontario Elections, but the people at once said they had had enough of Mr. Macpherson's pamphlets. The former ones were so bad that the last one was never looked at—or, if it was looked at, it was only for the purpose of influencing votes in favor of Mr. Mowat. The issue of the pamphlet had the effect of giving Mr. Mowat a majority he never expected. With regard to the expenditure of the Senate, I think this House has good reason to complain of some of the items, of the enormous amount spent in interior decorations and preparations for dinners, and everything of that kind. There has been nothing of the kind at this end of the House. I was obliged several times, while sitting on that side of the House, to call attention to some items in the Estimates, regarding the Senate expenditure. The hon. gentleman, now, must not be surprised if the items are brought up for discussion, and discussed calmly and carefully, as they have been, I think. The hon. member for West Middlesex, discussed the matter with perfect calmness, and in a very moderate tone. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government admitted that there was cause of complaint, and it is the business of this branch of the Legislature to discuss these matters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not object to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; but the hon. gentleman will not move a finger except to condole with his friends, the President of the Council or the Speaker of the Senate—to condole with the latter in his attempts to control the expenditure of the Upper House when he was not able to accomplish it. Now, Sir, we have before us the fact that a body of this Legislature—I admit equal with this in every respect as to its legislative power with regard to matters affecting its own interior economy—is making extravagant expenditures. We must exercise some sort of influence upon that body, and if we find that though our own officers and our own messengers do immensely more work than is done in the Senate, they are paid no more than is paid in the Senate, it follows that either our people are underpaid or theirs are overpaid, and a public remonstrance by the members of this House, whether in conversation this way or otherwise, seems to be an absolute necessity. I think that the right hon. gentleman, controlling as he does such an enormous majority in the Senate, has surely control enough to carry some measure of reform in regard to this expenditure. I feel quite certain that if his own colleagues can do nothing there, if he will apply to such men as Senators Bellerose and Trudel, I have no doubt they will aid him to secure the needed reform. In the meantime, I enter my protest as a