

the hon. gentleman makes these unfair and unworthy remarks.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very sorry that Canadian artists are hardly to be compared to those mechanical artists who painted Sam Slick's clocks, and that this is one native industry that does not receive encouragement from the Administration of the day. The hon. gentleman has raised a serious question. He has not only invited my hon. friend behind the door, but he has brought us all behind the scenes, and he has told us that the extravagance, which he admits prevails in the conduct of affairs in the other branch of the Legislature, is due, in effect, to the Committee on Contingencies, in which, he says, his colleague protested and complained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, he said that if the hon. gentleman had been behind the door, he would have heard the voice of the Speaker of the Senate exclaiming: "Do not add that to the salary of my messenger; remember my speeches throughout the country; remember the pamphlets I have written; remember the attacks I have made on the other side; I beg, I pray of you not to put me in a false position." And then he would have heard the Committee trying to drown the voice of the Speaker, and insisting on the increase which the hon. gentleman does not propose to defend but to laugh through the House. Now, we had a Contingency Committee here, and we abolished it, and appointed a Commission of Internal Economy, who were responsible to the House, and prepared the items with the assistance of the Speaker. Why cannot the hon. gentleman who possesses so much influence in the other Chamber, suggest to the unfortunate Speaker, who is so overborne in this Committee, that his policy cannot prevail in the matter of the Estimates, to introduce into the Senate the reform that was admitted a few years ago here, and have a Commission of Internal Economy to regulate these affairs there, so that Governmental responsibility might be introduced into the Estimates there, as here? It appears to me that the statement that the hon. gentleman has given us of the mode by which, in defiance of the hon. gentleman's colleague, these Estimates are made up, leads inevitably to that conclusion. Now, I am not disposed to blame the Senate very much for the short hours they have occupied this Session. It is well known that their business depends on the assiduity of this House; it is well known that the great bulk of the measures are initiated here, and until they reach the Senate, there is very little for that body to do; it is well known that the hon. gentleman's policy in this House—in this respect progressive, although in other respects we call it retrogressive—has been to postpone to as late a day as possible, the business of this House, and this Session this has been done to a greater extent than before. The conditions to which I have referred render it impossible they should have the late sittings we have. The great portion of their work is condensed into a small space at the end of the Session. It does seem a serious thing that our sessional messengers, who work sixteen hours a day on an average, should receive less than the messengers of the Senate, who have but short hours—ours receiving \$2 per day, and those of the Senate \$2.50 per day. The hon. gentleman this evening defended one extravagance by another. He raises the salary of one chaplain, and then asks if we can be so unreasonable as to require another to take a less sum; yet we find one particular class of officers, who work during long sittings, receiving less than others, who are engaged only during short sittings. This is a small matter, but it pervades, more or less, the whole estimate. I rather prefer to address myself to the question, whether the ordinary economy of the Senate should not be managed by the free action of that Chamber, guided, of course, by those who guide its deliberations ordinarily, on the same principle as

we manage ours. That would be attended with beneficial results, and save the hon. gentleman those painful scenes and unavailing remonstrances to which he has referred.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not surprised at the attempts which hon. gentlemen opposite have made to do that which they have never been able to find any of their friends or supporters, either in the press or the other branch of the Legislature, to do. The remark which has just fallen from the hon. gentleman gives us the "true inwardness," if I may venture to use a slang expression, of his attack on the Speaker of the Senate. That hon. gentleman had the misfortune to write a pamphlet which had an important effect at the time the people were suffering from the serious misgovernment of hon. gentlemen opposite. They know that the hon. gentleman occupying the high position of Speaker of the Senate is a man of great ability, who was able to exercise on a very important occasion very patent influence in bringing about a great change in public sentiment which led to the overthrow of the late Government. These hon. gentlemen have had the press in their hands to as great an extent as had Mr. Macpherson. They had their friends and supporters to meet and answer those statements. They had able colleagues in the Senate, when that hon. gentleman took the responsibility of vindicating the opinions he gave utterance to through the press, and they failed to find one prepared to meet the hon. gentleman, either in the press or in the Senate, and discuss that question in such a way as would vindicate their position. It is unworthy of the hon. gentlemen to take an opportunity of making an assault on a gentleman who is not here to answer them. It would have been more becoming on their part, to have endeavored to find some friends of their own, seated in the same branch in the Parliament of the country, face to face with the hon. gentleman, to raise this question. I do not rise for the purpose of drawing attention to that, nor of alluding to the anxiety hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have that the artists of this country should not have an opportunity of having occasionally brought before them the work of artists of the Old Country. I do not think it is any discredit to Canadian artists to say it is quite possible to teach them something in the way of portrait painting, or that it is at all out of the way that they should occasionally study the works of masters in their art, who have enjoyed far greater and wider opportunities than they. Indeed, without any reflection on them, it is not at all to be regretted that an opportunity should be taken of handing down, not only one of the ablest public men of Canada, to posterity, but of handing down the portrait of a gentleman whose physical and personal appearance is such as to be a source of pride to present and future Canadians, who will have an opportunity of looking upon it. I will touch the only important points raised by either of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I mean, first, the point raised by the hon. member for Middlesex, that a Senator is violating his position, is dishonoring the high position he occupies, by entering the political arena and taking part in a General Election. I join issue with the hon. gentleman on this point. There is no man in this country who holds a position so high, in my judgment, save him who is placed in the position of chief executive head of the country, that does not do honor to himself and good to the country by giving the people the benefit of his advice, whether through the press or on the platform, with reference to the administration of public affairs; nor did hon. gentlemen opposite find there was anything derogatory to the character of a Senator in taking part in popular elections when the hon. Mr. Scott, the able leader of the Government in the Senate, went, as is well known, into the popular arena and used all the influence he could exercise in controlling the popular elections. So far from finding fault with him, I say that a Senator, holding strong views on public questions, is bound to use the talents God has given