

is nominally at pleasure, but it is really removable only for cause. He holds his office during good behaviour practically as a judge holds his. What would be thought if we went back to the old and evil system under which judges held office at the pleasure of the Crown and could be removed at pleasure? To a very considerable extent the Lieutenant-Governor of a province should be an independent man. He occupies in some respects, between the two parties very much of a judicial position, and I believe, Sir, that the Constitution never contemplated—although there may be, and I suppose is, a loop-hole for this kind of thing to be done—the Constitution, I say, never contemplated that Lieutenant-Governors should be allowed to hold office simply at caprice and pleasure, on the understanding that if they pleased their friends at Ottawa they may keep a comfortable situation, and that if they do not please their masters they shall be bundled out without any formality of assigning a reason or without informing the House that their usefulness was gone, as was the case in a certain well remembered instance here. I wholly agree with the contention of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the contention of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier), that it is in the last degree inexpedient that except for a very short period, and for purposes of very temporary convenience, that this important office, an office which we have seen and known, may be used for the purpose of interfering very materially with the expressed will of the people, should be held by anybody, I do not care who he may be, on such a tenure as that by which Sir Leonard Tilley now holds the Lieutenant-Governorship of New Brunswick. With respect to the domestic quarrels of hon. gentlemen opposite we have very little to do. We do not care whether the party of the Minister of Inland Revenue, or whether the party of the Minister of Finance get the uppermost. We do not care much whether the new member comes from the east or the west or the south or the middle of New Brunswick. Let them settle these matters as they please. All I contend for is that in the interest of the public service, and for the purpose of discharging the duties of Lieutenant-Governor, it is of very great importance indeed that whoever may be chosen can hold his office during good behaviour, removable only for cause.

Mr. OUIMET. I am glad to see that we agree pretty well on the legal aspect of the question, that Lieutenant-Governors ought to hold office during pleasure, but not for a less period than five years. It is within the pleasure and prerogative of His Excellency the Governor in Council to continue beyond the five years his confidence in a gentleman who has been appointed to the position of Lieutenant-Governor, and this exercise of prerogative comes under the supervision of the House and the country, and for that, in this instance as well as in any other, the advisers of His Excellency are ready to

answer for any abuse that can be made of the exercise of His Excellency's prerogative. However, I must candidly say that this case must be looked at as an exceptional case. It is a comfort to see the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition admit that this exception is on behalf of an exceptionally good man. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) that it is very important that the Lieutenant-Governors should enjoy the fullest independence possible while they hold that high office. There is one point, however, on which we have differed in the past from hon. gentlemen, and that is as to the degree of independence with which Lieutenant-Governors should exercise their high powers. As to the late instance to which the hon. gentleman has referred, every one was much surprised that this question was not brought before the House last session, and we have remained under the impression that if the question of the independence with which the prerogative of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec had been exercised recently had not been brought before Parliament, it was because hon. gentlemen opposite did not expect to gain much credit for themselves in doing so.

Mr. FRASER. There is one point in this question which I think hon. gentlemen have forgotten. If the Lieutenant-Governor can be continued for one month after his term expires why not continue him for a year or five years or ten years? But there is another side to the question which I think this House should take some notice of. I hold that of all the unseemly things we can have in this young country, it is for a man to get up a petition for himself and hawk it around asking that he should be made Lieutenant-Governor. I think it is desirable in the extreme that a man holding such a high office should be of such character and position that he would be pointed out at once without any effort on his part as the person who should be selected. But for a member of Parliament, or for anybody else to get up a petition, and to attach his own letter to it making application for the office after the petition was signed by certain members, is derogatory to this Parliament and infamous in this new country. I conceive, Sir, that the Governors-General and the Lieutenant-Governors ought to be men of the highest character and men who should not find it necessary to try and get up a petition for themselves in favour of their appointment. Has it come to such a pass that the man who is to represent Her Majesty in a province, is to be a man who seeks the office like a common scavenger, moving among the members and asking them if they will not sign a petition that he should be Lieutenant-Governor? What a manly thing that is? With what dignity a man like that can fill the position? What honour he would confer upon the province and how well he would represent Her Gracious Majesty? I take it that in this country we should at once stamp out such a