

we are as able to furnish men fitted to discharge, in all the provinces, that high position—men from both parties—as worthily as any who could be obtained from the old country. Not only is that the case, but the reduction of salaries to which I pointed has been accomplished in the same way. I did challenge the act of the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia as a gross violation of the constitution of the country—and I was supported by the law officers of the Crown in England as to what was the proper course for him to pursue—and we called upon him before resigning and asked him to carry out what we regarded as the instructions from the Crown, and give the people of Nova Scotia the opportunity of electing a Parliament of which the majority would not be composed of persons notoriously disqualified from sitting or voting or otherwise taking charge of the public business. I probably used quite as strong language and stronger than I have been permitted by you, Sir, to use in another direction. Well, the Governor declined. He was advised to withstand that appeal, and he refused to give that dissolution which we asked. Then I carried the case before the country, and I may tell Mr. Power, if he does not know it, that I had the support of nine-tenths if not nineteen-twentieths of his co-religionists in Nova Scotia, who sustained me in my declaration that the constitution of the country had been violated by the Lieutenant-Governor. When we got to that ultimate tribunal, where the voice of the people could declare itself, the Government which had sustained the Lieutenant-Governor in that unconstitutional course was swept out of existence. The Hon. Joseph Howe, who was the leader of the government, was defeated in the county of Lunenburg. The members of his government, right and left, all over the province were driven out of office, and we came back to power with one of the largest majorities ever obtained in the olden times in that province. I think I had a majority of twenty-five at my back in that House. I give these particulars as showing what really took place. I may say that the Lieutenant-Governor accepted his defeat and took an early opportunity of retiring from his office and going back to England. But before he did that, he had the mortification of being obliged to call back to office the men whose advice he had refused, and also to restore to their positions, before he left the country, every official whom he had dismissed on the advice of his former Ministers. I do not intend to carry the parallel further, but I think, as the hon. gentleman has gone out of his way to give his version of this story, it is just as well we should clear up these historical records. I did not intend to say more on the question than I have said, and as this came up necessarily in connection with the action I have taken in this House on this very question, I felt it was my privilege to draw attention to it,

and I am very much obliged to you, Mr. Speaker, for not having, at an earlier moment, interfered with my statement of the facts.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sure I shall not surprise my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) if I tell him that I have no intention at all of discussing, on this occasion, issues arising out of events which took place forty years ago, almost, in the province of Nova Scotia. I do not know whether those issues are alive yet in the province of Nova Scotia or not. But if we are to judge of the feeling of Nova Scotia by the last verdict given by the people at the general election, they are not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend cannot say that as to the views expressed, whatever he may say as to myself, seeing that the province was carried on my policy.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not at all intend to question the statement of my hon. friend, or to consider whether it was upon his policy or not that it was carried. I suppose that the questions to which I have referred were settled about forty years ago. I do not know whether these questions are still alive in the province of Nova Scotia, but if they are alive at the present time, then the people of Nova Scotia must have reversed the views they held. I do not care to go into the many controversial questions upon which my hon. friend entered upon this occasion, with the single exception of that concerning the Senate of Canada. That is still a vital question, and it may be as well to know where we stand in regard to it. The hon. gentleman challenged the statement I made that it had been a settled policy of both parties at confederation, when the Senate was made a nominative and not an elective body, a policy agreed upon by Hon. George Brown and Sir John Macdonald, representing both great parties of Canada, that both parties should be represented on the floor of the Senate according to the proportion in which they were represented in the country. My hon. friend admits that this was the case, that this rule was admitted so far as the first appointments to the Senate were concerned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, Sir, if this was understood to be the rule when the first appointments were made, will he pretend to the House that it was a rule to be applied only once and after that disregarded? What would have been the opinion of the people of Canada if they had been told that this rule was a good rule for the appointment of the first Senate, but that it would not be afterwards followed? Any man of common sense would say that if it was a good rule for the first appointments it was a good rule for all times. If it was proper to have both parties represented according to their respective forces in the country