

House protest year after year against such a course being followed by the Government. In vain did they rise against such an apparent contempt for the constitution. Their voices were heard, but they had not even the satisfaction of hearing hon. gentlemen composing the majority of this House echoing their sentiment to show that they would not allow such a course to be followed by the Government. We, the French minority, were left unrepresented. We were abandoned by our colleagues of another nationality who took no interest in such a violation of the constitutional law. Some of our compatriots did no better, it is true, but to them I have nothing to say. It is a sufficient punishment that they are known, and that posterity will hold them responsible for all the evil to come and the consequences of the course they have followed. What would be the use of trying to stimulate their patriotism now when they could not be induced at the proper time to imitate our predecessors, who fought to the last for the enjoyment of the privileges which they finally secured, and succeeded in preserving and transmitting to us and to our care? Such an indifference as that shown by this House in not forcing the Government to respect the constitution could not be expected to bear anything but mischief. It did bear mischief. The whole Senate was punished by the very same wrong of which the hon. members had indirectly approved by the silence they kept when the French members of this House had called for their help. Sir John Macdonald, having succeeded so well in depriving the minority in this House of their constitutional right to a French speaking Minister, thought he might safely go a step further, and did not hesitate to advance his own interests at the expense of this House, convinced that there was not sufficient independence in Parliament to force him and his Government to respect the agreement made at confederation and act in the spirit of the constitution. Let me review briefly the events which have occurred since the 1st of July, 1867, when the British North America Act came in force. In conformity with an honest interpretation of the new constitution, the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, having been the first Premier charged with forming an Administration under the new *régime*, called from the Senate no less than five of his Ministers, amongst them one or two French speaking Senators, and all of them

holding portfolios. True, at that time Sir George Cartier was alive, and the recognized leader of the province of Quebec. At that time Sir John A. Macdonald would not have dared to attempt what he subsequently did, but after the death of Sir George Cartier, which took place a few months after Sir John A. Macdonald's Government was forced to resign, the Mackenzie Administration took office, and gave this House two Ministers, one of whom represented the French minority. In 1878 the Mackenzie Government was defeated, and Sir John A. Macdonald was again called upon to form a Cabinet. At that time two English-speaking Senators were made members of his administration. Later, a third English-speaking Minister without portfolio was given to this House. If my memory serves me right this occurred in 1880. This state of things continued until 1887, when we were left with but one Minister, an English-speaking Senator without portfolio. He alone was left to occupy the Ministerial benches in this House. In 1888 a second English-speaking Minister without portfolio was appointed, giving to this important body but two English-speaking Ministers without responsibility, being without portfolio. One of these two Ministers was in 1891 appointed President of the Council, and in that position affairs stood in this House until a few days ago, when the late Premier, Sir J. J. C. Abbott, resigned. Now, there is not a member of this House who could rise in his place and state that the course pursued by the late Premier and his predecessor was in any way in accord with the practice in England, or in conformity with the principles enunciated by authorities on Parliamentary Government, or with the parliamentary practice in England or in any of her colonies. None of us, I am sure, would ignore the fact that in England a considerable number of the Cabinet Ministers, when not a majority of them, have their seats in the House of Lords. In our sister colonies the principle to which I have referred has always been followed or advocated in Victoria, New South Wales, New Zealand, &c. Let me refer to a case in point in the colony of Victoria. The Victoria Government some years ago entered upon the same course that Sir John A. Macdonald pursued here. Formal complaints were made by the Legislative Council but no attention was paid to them by the executive. At last both Houses rose in