

since, and I do not yet know whether I am to receive the office or not. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) if he thinks that a proper mode in which to treat an appointment made under those circumstances? Does he think it justice to the individual? The hon. gentleman has the advantage of being a lawyer, and I am not in a position to speak as to the question of law, but every one knows that under ordinary circumstances this gentleman who was appointed to the office would have the right to a fiat to compel the Government to pay him the salary that had been proclaimed to the country as attached to the appointment which had been signed by His Excellency. I hold that this Government were bound to do one of two things. They were bound to install every one of these appointees in their offices and communicate the fact to them; or, if from any reason that subsequently occurred they felt that they were justified in cancelling the appointment, they should have cancelled it by Order in Council, and notified the person that he was not to receive the office. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), will, I think, admit that the humblest individual in the country is entitled to at least that at the hands of the Government.

Another case occurs to my mind. I was informed of a vacancy which had taken place in the Library, because of a resignation, and in virtue of the right which belonged to me I nominated a gentleman for that position. He was appointed by His Excellency the Governor General, and his name appeared in the list of those whom the Premier said, had been absolutely appointed, and as to whom there was no qualification whatever. That young gentleman, down to this hour, has never received the slightest intimation from the Government, as to whether he is to be called upon to discharge these duties or not. It is a question of only \$400 a year, but it was a matter of great importance to that young man. If the Government were inclined to cancel these appointments, the least they could do in justice to themselves and in justice to the parties concerned, was to have given these persons notification. My attention has been called to many similar cases, and so far as I am able to learn, many of those appointees have been superseded by the appointment of other persons. I should fail in my duty to the House if I did not give the Prime Minister an opportunity of stating on what grounds his Government pursued this entirely unprecedented course.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) so far forgot himself, in the discussion to which I refer, as to allude to me as an office grabber. On what grounds was I an office grabber? If it was office grabbing for the head of a Government to make ninety-two recommendations, I ask him how he characterizes himself and the late lamented Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, the leader of his Government, when, after they had met with an over-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

whelming defeat at the hands of the people, they grabbed no less than 116 appointments, and 17 promotions. I am quite sure that had my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) reflected he would not have used that term in reference to me. If it were worth the time of the House I could vindicate myself most emphatically, from the first hour of my entering into public life down to the present moment, from the charge of being an office grabber. I believe, if there is a public man in this country, who can vindicate himself against such a charge as that, it is myself.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Some hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." and I am quite sure that if he be acquainted with the past history of this country and with my own history, he does not intend that as anything else than an emphatic endorsement of what I am saying.

Mr. CASEY. Hardly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not desirous to take up the time of the House at length, but as I had not an opportunity of replying to my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) on a former occasion, I want to call his attention to a very grave error into which he fell. The hon. gentleman then said in reference to the Senate:

I charge here against him (meaning myself) and against his party, that, in so far as the Senate of Canada is concerned, they have all along, for the past eighteen years, disregarded the constitution of Canada in the nature of the appointments which they made to that branch of the legislature. It was one of the well-understood principles at confederation—and the hon. gentleman referred a moment ago to the debates of the Quebec Convention—it was one of the well-understood principles then, that if the Senate was not elective, and if it was to be appointed by the Crown, then both political parties should be equally represented on the floor of the Senate.

I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) made that statement in good faith, but he was entirely mistaken. No such principle was ever established, and the very authority he quotes to prove it, disproves his statement, as I shall show. What occurred was this. The House is well aware, that when the question of the constitution of the Senate came to be considered, for many years an elective legislative council had existed in Old Canada—the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario united—and that in the other provinces, the legislative councils consisted of persons appointed by the Crown. Well, Sir, as I need not remind any member of this House, confederation was accomplished by a combination of the Liberal party and the Conservative party. It was a coalition Government, and there was at Quebec, the Hon. George Brown, the Hon. Mr. Howland and the Hon. Wm. McDougall representing the Lib-