

after the adoption of the address to His Excellency; but inasmuch as the mover of the address and certain other hon. gentlemen have referred to the changes which have taken place in the Administration, I presume that I shall be pardoned if I follow their example. I fully endorse what was said by the hon. mover of the address, and by other hon. gentlemen too, with respect to the honours which have been conferred upon the leader of this House since last session. The honour which Her Majesty was graciously pleased to bestow on that hon. gentleman is one to which he is, in my opinion, entitled. I think that the leader of this House should be a knight, and I am certain that the leader of the government should, if he wishes, be a knight; and if any Conservative is entitled to the distinction, nobody deserves it better than the hon. gentleman who leads this House, apart altogether from his position. This government is a protectionist government. The hon. gentleman is a thorough-going protectionist. He has been a protectionist for a good many years, and has been consistent as far as he knew how to be; and, what distinguishes him from a great many other protectionists, he is, I believe, thoroughly honest in his advocacy of protection. The hon. gentleman has also been promoted to the leadership of the government, and those qualifications and claims which entitle him to the honour of knighthood, entitle him in a great degree, to be leader of a protectionist government. Apart altogether from the hon. gentleman's political views, we have had some experience of him in this House. He has been the leader of the Senate for two sessions previous to the present one, and he has shown himself economical and business-like in dealing with the affairs of the Senate. If he deals in the same way with the business of the country, I have no doubt that under his leadership we shall have as good a government as we can get from the Conservative party. Any deviations which may take place from the right path in the conduct of the government—and I have no doubt there will be a good many—must be attributed not to the hon. gentleman, but to his wicked partners in the other House of Parliament. There was one thing that struck me in the speeches of two or three hon. gentlemen who preceded me—particularly the speech of the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, who

seconded the address. These hon. gentlemen dealt in a very feeling way with the recent mortality amongst premiers. Now, I respect and admire the hon. leader of the government and of this House, and I have a very considerable degree of affection for that hon. gentleman, and if this mortality amongst premiers is to continue, I believe that the hon. gentleman's chances of living a long time, as we all hope to see him live, will be very much promoted by his coming to this side of the House and allowing my hon. friend from Ottawa to take the seat which he now occupies. Hon. gentlemen laugh. They do not seem to perceive that the mortality has prevailed only amongst Conservative premiers; and perhaps after we have been in power for eighteen years we may not object to having some of our leaders die off too.

Another change has been made in the administration which has been referred to by one or two hon. gentlemen, and that is the taking into the government of the hon. gentleman from Marshfield. Although I do not know very much of the hon. gentleman's career in Prince Edward Island, I know enough to be aware that he has been a very prominent and active member of the Conservative party there for many years—that probably for the last few years he has been the most prominent and active member of that party in Prince Edward Island, and we know that since he has been in this chamber he has been active in doing the work of the government and of the Conservative party; and I do not think any one will question his claim to the seat in the government which he now occupies. It has occurred to me that, while that is perfectly true, there was a great deal of force in what was said by the hon. gentleman from British Columbia the other day, when he complained that his province, during all the years it has been in the union, has never had a representative in the Cabinet. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman gave the reason or not—I am disposed to think he did—but I consider that one of the principal reasons for that non-representation in the Cabinet is that British Columbia has sent to Parliament an unbroken phalanx of supporters of the Conservative government. If British Columbia had done as Prince Edward Island has done—sent four out of six members to oppose the Government—it is not unlikely that the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Macdonald) would have been