

Everybody knew that in case of an election Mr. Gladstone's seat was not safe, though when the time came he was in fact elected. The final state and the outlook could not be better described than in a letter from Lord Halifax to Mr. Gladstone (Dec. 9):—

. . . . Up to the meeting of parliament you clearly must act as if there was no doubt. If you do not, you almost admit being wrong. You must assume yourself to be right, that you are justified in the course which you have taken, and act consistently on that view. When parliament meets, I think the proper course would be for the Speaker to say that he had received a certificate of vacancy from two members, but not the notice from the member himself, and having doubts he referred the matter to the House, according to the act. This ensures the priority of the question, and calls on you to explain your not having sent the notice. You state the facts as above, place yourself in the hands of the House, and withdraw.

Now I put to the House, Sir, this position, that Mr. Morley was clearly of the opinion that it could not be said that the ministry of Gladstone had met parliament unless Gladstone himself was there. He himself felt that was so. And so in this case, Sir, it cannot be said under any circumstances that parliament has been met by the ministry, unless the Prime Minister—the alleged Prime Minister—is in his place in or a member of either house of parliament.

Now let us read a moment what Mr. Gladstone says himself as to the desirability of a member of the government finding a seat in one house of parliament or the other; I again quote him:

Soon after the session of 1846 began, it became known that the protectionist petition against the Peelite or Liberal sitting member for Wigan was likely to succeed in unseating him, proposals were made to me to succeed him, which were held to be eligible, I even wrote my address; on a certain day I was going down by the mail train. But it was an object for our opponents to keep a secretary of state out of parliament during the corn law crisis, and their petition was suddenly withdrawn. The consequence was that I remained until the resignation of the government in July, a minister of the crown without a seat in parliament. This was a state of things not agreeable to the spirit of parliamentary government.

This is Mr. Gladstone:

And some objection was taken, but rather slightly, in the House of Commons. Sir R. Peel stood fire.

Now proceeds Mr. Morley:

There can be little doubt that in our own day a cabinet minister without a seat in either house of parliament would be regarded, in Mr. Gladstone's words, as a public inconvenience and a political anomaly too dark to be tolerated.

The language of Mr. Morley is, "too dark", and he emphasizes the word "dark"—"too dark to be tolerated". That is exactly the position to which I am coming.

I have alluded to 1846 because my learned and hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald, Antigonish-Guysborough) seemed to attach some im-

portance to it, and I venture to point out to him that in his later years it is recorded that when Mr. Gladstone saw fit to refer to the incident he deprecated it, and Morley said that it would be "too dark to be tolerated." What was too dark for Morley to tolerate is not too dark for King to sanction. That is the position you must take.

Let us go a step further. An Address from His Excellency has been presented to parliament. Whose is it? It is certain that this parliament in the light of the observations made by Mr. Gladstone himself and by the Earl of Selborne, had a right to say that the Prime Minister should be at least in one house of parliament or the other in respect to that Address. The Address is supposed to be the emanation of the mind and brain of the Prime Minister. His colleagues assist, it is said, but he is responsible for the writing of it. I took the trouble this morning to look at the Canadian Almanac to ascertain who constitute the government of this country, and I find that on November 19 a record was sent to that publication that the government consisted of a number of gentlemen, some of whom are now opposite me, some of whom are in the Senate, but some of whom have a seat neither in the Senate nor the Commons. I refer to Mr. Marler and Mr. Vincent Massey, who never were departmental heads. Are these ministers of His Excellency? Are they responsible for this speech? "My ministers advise me", so and so. Are these the men who are responsible? To whom? To this House? To yonder House? Whom are these men responsible to who have no seat in either House? We are told that the former Minister of Railways, Mr. Graham, has no intention of remaining. We are told of the speech made by Mr. Marler to the Reform Club of Montreal on New Year's Day, in which he indicated the legislative programme of the present alleged administration. But who are these men? To the law they are strangers, in this House they are strangers. We have had placed before us a list of the members of the House of Commons and of the Senate. You look in vain for the name of King; you look in vain for the name of Marler; you look in vain for the name of Massey; you look in vain for the name of Graham; you look in vain for the name of Low. And yet, Sir, I am told—I only know it from hearsay—that these men are the advisers of the sovereign.

Could anything be more disastrous to parliamentary institutions? Never has parliament been flouted in this manner before—in Canada at any rate. What did Sir John A. Macdonald do? Defeated in Kingston as he was