

such a share as that asked for. No doubt the hon. leader of this House is not serious when he makes such statements, he knows as well as myself that the facts he refers to do not prove that he is right, and that I am wrong, but on the contrary, they prove that he is wrong and that I am right. He cannot have forgotten that two French Speakers were appointed to preside over the Senate during the two first Parliaments as a compensation for the appointment of an English gentleman to preside over the Commons during the same two Parliaments. Neither can he have forgotten that in 1873, when Mr. Mackenzie's Government appointed Messrs. Anglin and Christie, to preside respectively over the Senate and the Commons, he gave full compensation to Quebec and to the French element by giving two Catholic ministers in this House—one Irish from Ontario, and the other of French origin from the Province of Quebec—while to-day we have both Speakers of English origin and from Ontario, and six or seven ministers from the same province out of fourteen or fifteen of a Cabinet. The hon. leader of the Government claims that because the population of French origin are but one-fourth of the whole Canadian people, therefore we are not entitled to have at all times a minister of French origin in the Senate; but he forgets that under the constitution the two languages are placed on the same footing, and the numerical strength of the two nationalities is not considered.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I beg most respectfully to say a few words of explanation, and as I do not intend to detain the House, I hope hon. gentlemen will bear with me. I wish merely to call attention to this fact, that in dealing with this disagreeable question I did my best to divest it of every characteristic of personality; more than that, I used my best efforts to make this House understand that in the remarks I felt obliged to make, far from having anything to say personally against the hon. gentlemen who at present occupy the treasury benches, or the hon. Speaker of this House, I stated that I was sure we could rely on them to do full justice. But I confess that above the personal question there are constitutional considerations, and I have been surprised

to hear the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice, who is a lawyer, and who no doubt in his professional experience has had to argue with a judge and declare that he was not competent in a case. Supposing that a case should be taken to the Supreme Court without first passing through the Court of Appeal in the Province, and a lawyer goes to argue the case, his adversary might say, "Well you ought not to come to this Court; I challenge the competency of the tribunal"—and the reply might be, "Have you not confidence in the Judge who presides in this Court?" This would not be fair; and thus so long as the hon. Minister of Justice does not answer the constitutional argument which I laid down before the House, it is not fair to change the ground and make of this a question of personality, while in reality it is a constitutional question. I repeat that I have nothing to say against the hon. gentlemen who occupy those seats, but is it a fact or not that Confederation was established on the principle that on representation by population being granted in the other House, the equality should be restored in this House? Is it not as plain as the sun, that now amongst the twenty-four members belonging to one of the Provinces, there are four belonging to the Government? And these twenty-four members, with the ministerial influence, are at least twice as powerful as any other twenty-four, and thus the strict equality which was an express condition of Confederation, is destroyed. If I am wrong when I lay down this argument, I should like the Minister of Justice to shew it to the House, but I do not think that hon. gentlemen will attempt to shew it, for he remembers well that on a previous occasion he admitted here, that if not the letter at least the spirit of the constitution is violated by the fact of the French element not having representation in this House.

Now I repeat it again, it is very unpleasant for us to be repeatedly obliged to call the attention of the Government to this question, but we consider it a matter of duty. Our respected colleague from Mille Isle (Mr. Masson) said that it is a strange thing we should advocate these rights in English,—but it is because we wish to put the question to the whole Senate, because we want to appeal to the spirit of justice of the whole House, that