

There is an alteration in the *personnel*. Mr. Mousseau, Secretary of State, resigned and went to Quebec, where he held the position of Premier. Mr. O'Connor resigned on account of ill-health. Mr. J. C. Pope resigned also on the same account. Mr. Aikins resigned, and was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chapleau has become a member of the Government. I am very sorry he is not here to-day at the beginning of the Session; but he has been stricken down by an acute attack of bronchitis, which compelled him to resort to a southern clime. Mr. Carling, the Member for London, has become Postmaster-General. Mr. Costigan, of New Brunswick, has been made Minister of Inland Revenue, and the Hon. Frank Smith, of the Senate, is a member of the Cabinet without a portfolio.

Mr. BLAKE. I learn from the hon. gentleman that he suggests we should adopt the English practice. That has not been the custom here. The hon. gentleman himself has demanded explanations of changes very much less important than those of to-day. He has given what he calls explanations, but which are very much more like a catalogue or calendar of changes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A catalogue raisonné.

Mr. BLAKE. No; a catalogue without reasons. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Pope, from Prince Edward Island, left the Cabinet on account of ill-health. That fact was made but too apparent to us all, as for a considerable time the hon. gentleman was unfortunately disabled from much of his ministerial duties. I remember very well, when a vacancy took place by reason of the appointment to office of an hon. Minister who represented the Island formerly, the cries of grief and indignation which proceeded from the supporters of the hon. gentleman because there was no representative of Prince Edward Island placed instead of that gentleman in the Cabinet. I am glad to observe that as times have changed: o have manners, and the absence of a representative from the Island has been *received*—I do not know whether there have been any muttered tones of grief poured into the private ear of the hon. gentleman, whether there have been any suggestions as to the injury done the Island in general, or Islanders in particular—at any rate the public does not hear any more the cries of injustice and wrong which vexed our ears on a former occasion. The hon. gentleman has stated that Mr. Costigan has accepted the office of Inland Revenue, and the Hon. Frank Smith has been called to a seat in the Cabinet without a portfolio. I suppose in that instance, at any rate, we should have had explanations, because I remember the language used by the hon. gentleman on the subject of seats in a Cabinet without a portfolio. In 1873, a Government was formed in which there were two seats filled by gentlemen without a portfolio. The hon. gentleman asking for and receiving explanations of the formation of that Cabinet, and learning that fact, used this language:

"There is another phase in the formation of this Government, and I protest against it. I protest against Mr. Blake being a member of the Government without a portfolio and I protest against Mr. Scott holding that same position. I say it is utterly unconstitutional. I say there has been only one example of it—that of Lord Lansdowne—to which everybody submitted, because he was a man ninety years of age, and it was thought to be a fitting compliment to him, though it was an infringement of the Constitution. This country, Sir, wants no unpaid services, it wants no unpaid officers, it wants and is able to pay every man for performing its services."

I cannot render this protest, this denunciation of constitutional doctrine, with the force, energy, vigor and spirit of genuine indignation, at the violation of the Constitution, which animated my hon. friend on that memorable occasion when, seated under the gallery in the seat now occupied by the hon. member for Montmagny, I was unable to say a word for myself, stricken down by the hon. gentleman's eloquence. He has set me up again and relieved me from

the incubus of a violation of the Constitution. He has announced, as the most natural thing in the world, that the Hon. Frank Smith is a member of the Cabinet without portfolio. Well, the Hon. Frank Smith is not Lord Lansdowne, and he is not ninety years old, and, therefore, the reason which the hon. gentleman gave, as not justifying, but palliating the infringement of the Constitution in the case of Lord Lansdowne, does not apply to the hon. Senator. Therefore, I think, I may call for further explanations. I may ask the hon. gentleman to say whether he was wrong then or now, because it seems to me quite impossible he could have been right on both occasions, unless there has been a revolution in the Constitution. I observe that the changes, the distribution of the great political prizes, which belong to an Administration, gave rise to the same results, differing a little from what the hon. gentleman propounded at the outset of Confederation. I never thought that the hon. gentleman was wise in laying down a cast-iron rule as he did, that there should be a certain number of members and a certain proportion assigned to certain Provinces. I always agreed that the interests of the country and the exigencies of carrying on a Government, so as to maintain the confidence of the people, would necessitate a representation of the Provinces in the Cabinet. I believe it is important that this object should be a prominent one in the formation of every Cabinet. But what the hon. gentleman did was to declare, as the cause for thirteen Ministers, the fact that there ought to be a certain proportion—five for Ontario, four for Quebec, two for Nova Scotia and two for New Brunswick—because, as he explained, one Minister from one of those smaller Provinces would feel lonely without a colleague from the same Province in the Council to assist him in reaching the conclusion and in strengthening the aggressiveness from that Province. These were the reasons the hon. gentleman assigned as the constitutional proportions of a Cabinet for our Confederation. But times in that respect also have changed, for I observe that we have no longer in the hon. gentleman's Cabinet five members from Ontario, but six members, and that to that Province, besides the six members, are also assigned the two great political prizes which come and go with Administrations, as we now learn from your precedent—the Speakership of this House and the Speakership of the other body. There are altogether sixteen, fourteen members of the Cabinet and two holders of these prizes, and of these Ontario receives eight, just one half. Well, the hon. gentleman boasts to this House of some fifty-five followers from Ontario, and he boasts nearly that many from the neighboring Province of Quebec. No doubt, as he has abandoned the principle of proportion, and has come to the principle of fitness, we must take this as a proof that his followers from Ontario are stronger proportionally—in their quality even more than they are in their quantity—than from the Province of Quebec. With such a great strength as I see in reserve upon the benches from Ontario, I can congratulate my friends from that Province upon the high appreciation, the deserved appreciation, that they receive, not merely absolutely but relatively, in this Administration; and I can condole with my hon. friends from the other Provinces upon the position they occupy in the same sense. Not merely are these proportions which the hon. gentleman himself set up, violated, but when it was necessary to make a change in the representation from Quebec, it was found that no one at that time belonging to Parliament from that Province was suitable, and my hon. friend was obliged to look outside for the gentleman whose regretted illness he has referred to, and introduce him into the Cabinet, at the special instance, I suppose, and for the special comfort of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. Now, I am glad to know that this happy family is no longer constituted according to a cast-iron principle, and that the hon.