

appointment and every recommendation was approved, I hold in strict conformity with Imperial precedents and precedents established on former occasions when the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald resigned in 1873—all those appointments and recommendations made by the leader of the Government and his colleagues were sanctioned by Lord Dufferin who was then Governor General. Acting under the well-known rule that in the absence of any previous rule, it is the duty of the Governor General to follow English precedents, all those appointments were properly sanctioned by Lord Dufferin as Governor General. When the Government of which I had the honour to be the head was defeated by a majority insignificant in comparison with that which had defeated the Government of which Mr. Mackenzie was the First Minister, made, as I hold properly, 92 recommendations, a much smaller number than were made by Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, 26 were refused, as I hold entirely in violation of the principles of parliamentary government and all English precedents, and as I hold in the strongest possible violation of the principles established by Lord Dufferin on two similar occasions, namely, the resignation of the Administration of Sir John Macdonald, in 1873, and the defeat of the Mackenzie Government in 1878.

The hon. gentleman knows that the reports of the Treasury Board recommending a large number of these appointments were submitted to the Governor General; that he, in the exercise of his discretion or indiscretion, took the extraordinary course of undertaking to judge as to what appointments should be sanctioned and what should not. His Excellency signed those Treasury reports with a qualification. That signature was the most valid and complete authority the Governor General could give to all those appointments that did not come within the category of the exceptions he took as to the recommendations. The decision as to those appointments which came within the category to which the Governor General took exception was submitted to the judgment of the hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues. They exercised that judgment, and subsequently brought down and laid on the Table of the House a report of those appointments, which, under the signature of the Governor General, had been made valid and complete according to his own declaration. My hon. friend was asked, what was the position of those appointments? His answer was, those appointments will stand. It was not possible for my hon. friend to give any other answer, because it was perfectly obvious that having, as a leader of the Administration, brought down those appointments and declared they had received the imprimatur and sanction of the Governor General, it was quite obvious that those parties held those positions by the most indefeasible

tenure possible. I quite admit that it was perfectly competent for the hon. gentleman to exercise his judgment, and to review any appointments that were made. The fact that the appointments were made within parliamentary rule does not take them out of the category of appointments which can be reviewed by the Government, if they are able to show any reasons why such appointments should be changed or recalled. But no greater publicity could be given to those appointments than the fact that they were embodied in the statement laid on the Table of the House as appointments proposed by the previous Government and sanctioned by the Governor General, and the addition of the emphatic declaration by the First Minister that those appointments will stand. The House will be a little surprised to learn, hon. members ought to be surprised to learn if they are not, that down to this day an extraordinary, I do not hesitate to say an unprecedented course has been pursued in regard to a large number of those appointments. I do not say in regard to every one that those parties have been left without any communication whatever from the Government down to the present day. I cannot imagine that greater disrespect could be shown to the Crown or to the Governor General of Canada than to lay on the Table of Parliament a statement of appointments with the declaration made by the First Minister, and that those parties should be left without receiving any communication whatever from the Government respecting their position. I am not prepared to say that this has occurred in every case, but I know that in several cases it has occurred.

At the outset, I may say that the whole of the recommendations made by the Government of which I had the honour to be a member, had reference to insignificant positions, with the exception of the names of four gentlemen who were nominated for seats in the Senate. Instead of there being appointments of judges to the Supreme Court, or the county courts, or of persons to positions with large salaries attached, they were all appointments made in the ordinary course to fill vacancies in the public service, and with comparatively small salaries, as any person who takes the trouble to run his eye over the list will see. I do not intend to go into this matter fully, but I shall give one instance. A gentleman came to me a short time ago and said: The House and the country were notified that I had been appointed collector of customs at a salary of \$800, but I have not received a word of communication from the Government up to the present time; I assumed that I was appointed, and I am not in a position to take up any other employment, because I daily expect that the published decision of the Governor General in Council will be given effect. I have been left in a condition of expectancy and doubt ever