

their might and appointed a joint committee on constitutional reform, whose report showed the necessity of having constantly in the Upper House at least two, and if possible more, responsible ministers. I find on reference to the various authorities whose works are in our Library that this principle is clearly laid down. Even our own Canadian authority, Mr. Todd, in his "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies" writes:—

A patriotic statesman, filling the honourable position of Premier, will readily apprehend that it is in the interest not to say the paramount duty of every minister so as to shape his course as, if possible, to keep the two Houses of Parliament in harmony, and not to throw himself absolutely and entirely into the hands of one branch of the legislature, regardless of the wishes and feeling of the other.

Such is the practice in England, such also are the principles advocated in her colonies, such also has been the course followed by the two late administrators who have ruled over Canada during the last fifteen years, so far as the question I am dealing with is concerned. Who could believe this history of the last fifteen years to be true except he had been, as members of the Senate have been, a witness to the different facts I have related? Indeed, how could any man believe that the Government had acted in this way and be allowed to continue in their evil course from year to year? It is true members of this House have repeatedly complained of such a state of things. I know that some of our colleagues privately remonstrated with the Government on the subject. It is also true that many of them met together and determined to put a stop to such an injurious course on the part of the executive, and that some steps were privately taken to carry such a determination into effect. But what have been the results? What have those secret efforts done? Nothing, except to convince the existing Government that they were all right, that they had nothing to fear, that the Senate would not rise against them, and they could continue with impunity in their evil course. So they did until the time—a few days ago—when the present Premier was called upon to form a new Cabinet and set things right. Could those two previous administrators have done anything better calculated to throw discredit on the Senate and ruin its influence? Yet the majority of this House kept quiet. They

submitted for fifteen years to such treatment. Nay, by their silence hon. members have encouraged the Government to ruin this House in the opinion of the people at large. The Senate allowed the Government to take its own course, and to trample upon the great charter of the rights and privileges of the people of this Dominion. What necessity then for a constitution? What is its use, if in spirit as well as in letter it can be set aside with impunity? What advantage is there in having a Senate and a House of Commons, if their members are so partisan or so dependent on the executive as to fear to force them into conformity with the sacred law, the fundamental law of our country, in accordance with the letter as well as the spirit. What a difference there is between the course which we have followed here and the manly and patriotic stand taken by our fellow-subjects of Victoria. What is the reason of this difference? Do those people understand better than we do the Constitutional Government under which we live? Are they less partisan than we are? Are they of more independent temper than it is possible for us to be? I will not undertake to say, but the facts are there, and facts are stubborn things. I renew, gentlemen, my congratulations to the Premier. I congratulate the whole Cabinet on the step they have taken, a step by which they have shown their determination to do what is right, and to show their respect for the constitution. The noble conduct of the present administration in recognizing the right of the Senate to have a fair number of Cabinet Ministers, and of the French minority to be represented on the Treasury benches in this House is, in my opinion, of such importance that, although a majority of the present administration were members of the two preceding governments, those who, like myself, were dissatisfied with their past conduct might readily forgive and forget the past, and give the present Government a fair support. This I am ready to do as far as I can without sacrificing those principles which have guided me in the past. I shall always be true to sound Conservative principles, maintaining perfect independence in dealing with men and measures. Before I sit down, gentlemen, I beg to offer my compliments to the hon. gentleman who preceded me, in reference to what he has said as to the school question in Manitoba.