

thing as that. I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite; I trust that the First Minister, who I believe understands these matters and who has some conscience and some idea of the dignity of the position, will so treat any man who comes to him with a petition of that kind as to make it ever afterwards impossible for any of his servile followers to carry around a petition for signature asking that he should be appointed to an office for which neither honour, nor nature, nor dignity ever designed him to occupy.

Mr. LANGELIER. The instance mentioned by the Minister of Public Works is the very best proof of the wisdom of our constitution in reference to the office of Lieutenant-Governor. The hon. gentleman did not seem to have understood the arguments of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He says the Ministers are responsible to Parliament for the maintenance in power of the Lieutenant-Governor after his term has elapsed. We admit that; but it is exactly what the constitution does not want. The constitution has laid down the principle that the Ministers shall not have the Lieutenant-Governor in their hands or under their thumbs. While Lieutenant-Governor he is supposed to be independent of the Federal Ministry, only to be removed by Parliament for cause. There are great objections to his being maintained as Lieutenant-Governor after the five years are over. Then he is entirely in the power of the Government here instead of being independent of them. As to the instance mentioned by the hon. Minister of Public Works he could not have mentioned a worse instance. He says we did not bring up that question before. Well, we could bring it up this year. We have from the very mouth of the gentleman himself a statement of the way in which he acted as Lieutenant-Governor. We have him admitting that when the constitution was in his way he jumped over it; when his oath was in his way he jumped over his oath. He made that admission in the presence of the hon. Minister of Public Works in a speech which he delivered in Montreal.

Mr. OUMET. If the hon. gentleman will allow me; I was there present, and I never understood my hon. colleague to apply the allusion he made to his own conduct in Quebec.

Mr. LANGELIER. That is a new construction of his speech, because I have not seen a single ministerial paper which put any other construction upon it than the one I have given. He made the remark that when he found a wall in his way he jumped over it, and everybody understood that he referred to the wall of the constitution and the wall of his oath. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman complains that we did not bring that matter before this House. We had an opportunity lately to bring it before the people of Quebec. There was an election in L'Islet, and the hon. Minister of Public Works has a vivid re-

Mr. FRASER.

collection of that election. The gentleman to whom I am alluding has administered justice in the county of L'Islet and in two neighbouring counties. Yet he had not the courage to show himself in that election. It was claimed that he had saved the province of Quebec in those counties; and yet that saviour had not the courage to show himself in that county which it was claimed he had saved. The hon. Minister of Public Works, though a comparative stranger to that part of the country, went there, as did also the hon. Postmaster-General. Their own papers boasted that Mr. Angers, the gentleman alluded to, would go there also and carry the county before him; but he had not the courage to go there and boast of having jumped over the constitution. It was only in Montreal, at a meeting composed of the Tory party, that he made this great boast. He never ventured to appear anywhere else in the province of Quebec. Now, we are not afraid to discuss his conduct. It was outrageous, and it shows more than anything else the wisdom of our constitution, that it does not contemplate putting the Lieutenant-Governors under the thumb of the Ministers at Ottawa. His papers and his friends boasted that he had to come to Ottawa to sign official documents—that he refused to take the advice of those whom he was bound to follow, but, instead, took the advice of the Ottawa Ministers. In saying this I do not mention secrets revealed by the Ministers, but matters openly stated by his own political friends in the province of Quebec. We have had some most scandalous things in connection with the administration of justice in the province. There was an official magistrate in Rimouski whose administration was a disgrace to the province, and it was openly boasted that he would never be dismissed because he had assisted the hon. Postmaster-General in the election. It is an evidence of the wisdom of the constitution that it does not want to make the Lieutenant-Governors the mere tools of the party in power at Ottawa.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all surprised at the warmth with which the hon. gentleman seems to resent the action of the late Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman has more than one good reason for feeling very much annoyed at the action taken by my hon. colleague who now has a seat in the Senate. But the hon. gentleman, to my surprise, taxes the Hon. Mr. Angers with having been afraid to submit to the people of Canada the question of the manner in which he dealt with an Administration which disgraced the province of Quebec; and that, according to the hon. gentleman, is the reason he did not make his appearance in the county of L'Islet. Sir, the question of the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was submitted to the people of the province of Quebec in a constitutional way, and the answer