

political opponents may be personal friends. He was leader of this House for many years, and held various portfolios during his leadership. I forgot for the moment that amongst these had been the office of Minister of Justice; I hope to occupy the position a good deal longer than he did. I want to hold it as long as Sir Alexander Campbell was a member of this House, but I am not anxious otherwise to be here. I do not want a long term on the other side. When Sir Alexander Campbell became Lieutenant Governor I was his chief adviser. We had to do with political matters as well as other matters, and I am able to say that, during the whole of his Lieutenant Governorship, there was not one instance of friction between us. Nor did that arise from our friendship as making his case exceptional. I was Prime Minister under several other Governors who were strong Conservatives: Mr. Robinson, Mr. Crawford and Mr. Kirkpatrick—all of whom were strong party men—all were familiar with the duties of Lieutenant Governor and with political questions—and I had not one instance of friction with any of them in any of the political or other matters that came before us. Why may I not have a like experience in my relations with this House? Now, this House follows to a large extent the course of the House of Lords. This House recognizes the House of Lords as that public body which this House was constituted to signify in our constitution here in Canada. There are, of course, important differences which are unavoidable. This is a life appointed House. The House of Lords contains very few members of that kind and is mostly hereditary. One advantage of that system is that when a peer dies his successor is almost sure to be of the same political party. That has not been the case with regard to this House. During the last 18 years, as the country was in the hands of one political party, when Liberal members dropped off Conservatives were put in their places, and that is why the House is now constituted as it is. Then, again, there is a large respect existing in England, in all parties, for the old families and for old titles and for peers generally, and there is a prestige on that account which cannot exist here. A good deal is borne from the House of Lords—more probably than would be borne from them if they were

appointed as the members of this House are. All that has to be considered. The House of Lords is largely Conservative, though nothing like so Conservative as this House is; still it is Conservative, and its members endeavour to make the House work with Liberal governments as well as Conservative governments, and are constantly passing, and feel it their duty to pass, measures of a Liberal government of which they do not themselves approve. Very many instances of that kind will occur to you. One was the Reform Bill; that was passed reluctantly by the House of Lords. They did not believe in it. It was not only that it might lessen their own influence, they thought it would lessen the prosperity of the country, but still they submitted to it. There is an advantage which ministers there have which does not exist in this country and which could not exist in this country under our constitution. The ministers of the day there may, with the consent of the Crown, add any additional number of members to the House of Lords; and if the House of Lords refuses to pass measures which a Liberal government desire, there is always that power to prevent any evil from that cause, and the very fact of that power existing operates to prevent the necessity of its being exercised. Accordingly the Lords passed the Reform Bill. The Catholic Emancipation Bill is another example of the same thing. That bill was passed by the House of Lords without believing in it, but it was a demand of the country through the popular House, and the House of Lords acceded to it. The repeal of the Corn Laws is another example. Others are the Jewish Oaths Bill and some of the bills passed in recent years with reference to Ireland, ameliorating the condition of the people there. They did not believe in these measures, but they had been passed by the House of Commons, and the House of Lords acceded to them. Now what is the principle on which this House may be expected to act in their present novel circumstances? I know the House will not be an obstructive House. With all their experience of legislation and government and general affairs and with all the knowledge of history they possess, I do not think it is in the mind of anybody here that this House should be an obstructive House towards the Liberal government. Then what is the principle that is to govern their duties here? What are our