

agrees to confer with him before he had really resigned. It denied also what was of equal, if not of greater importance, the constitutional right of his Excellency to ask the advice of the resigning Minister as to whom he should send for. It was not necessary that the Lieutenant-Governor should ask that advice, but it was his right to ask it if he desired it. That advice could not be asked unless the resignation was tendered personally. In this case as Mr. Blake's resignation could be tendered personally within sixteen days after the written resignation had arrived, not only were Mr. Blake's friends justified in not sending in that resignation immediately, but it was their duty not to send it in. It was no excuse he was presenting to the House. They would have violated their duty had they deprived his Excellency of the constitutional right he should have had of asking Mr. Blake's advice as to his successor. In view of these considerations which he apprehended, were those which ought to govern the case to which the hon. gentleman had called their attention, he would move in amendment that all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted:—"That this House, while firmly adhering to the view that no person should for any length of time continue a member of the Executive Council without a seat in this House, is of opinion that the resignations of Messrs. Blake and Mackenzie as members of Executive Council, having been tendered at the earliest practicable moment after the return of Mr. Blake to this country, were in due time, and that the course taken in delaying the resignation till Mr. Blake's return was justified by sound constitutional principle and correct constitutional usage." (Cheers).

Mr. RICHARDS said that he had noticed some time previously that the motion now before the House was coming up, but he had had no opportunity of reading it until a few hours ago. If it was the case, as the honourable Premier had intimated, that the motion was the result of a general agreement between the members on his (the speaker's) side of the House, he, at all events, was no party to any such arrangement. However, he would vote in favour of the honourable member for Lincoln's resolution, believing that it set forth correctly a principle of constitutional law which declared that when gentlemen in the Government of this country had declared publicly that they did not any longer intend to take part in the affairs of the Province, as Cabinet Ministers, they should immediately resign. He did not understand the logic of the Attorney-General's opinion in regard to members of the Government resigning their seats when defeated in their constituencies, for it did not follow because a member of a Government had been defeated that he should resign his seat. No one would put forth such a ridiculous proposition. If such a rule were laid down, the country would be deprived of, in many instances, the services of its most able statesman. Mr. Gladstone, for instance, went to one of the ridings of Lancashire for election and was defeated, but no person thought that he should have resigned for that reason, and Mr. Gladstone went to another constituency and was returned. The mere fact of a man being defeated, he being a member of the Government, left it incumbent upon him to resign, was a wrong idea. There was hardly a constituency in the country where, if all influences at command were brought to bear against a member of the Government, and those influences concentrated in one particular constituency, that member could not be defeated, although at the same time he might possess the confidence of the country generally. There was also the case of the Hon. Robert Baldwin, who, in 1842, when a member of the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government, sought election in the County of Hastings and was unsuccessful, but no one considered it was incumbent upon him to resign for that reason. The ablest men would have been compelled to leave public life if they had had to resign because of being defeated in certain constituencies. The principle that had always been laid down, and he hoped always would be, was that as long as a member of a Government did not announce his intention to retire and stated that he meant to seek re-election, he should have a reasonable time allowed him in which to appeal to his constituents. Any rule than that would have a prejudicial effect; but he did not understand the hon. member for Lincoln to urge that such should be the case. The purport of the resolution was that when a member of the Government had resigned his position in the House, and had expressly declared by his acts that he was leaving public life so far as this House was concerned, then it was wrong for that member to retain his seat in the Government. He would ask honourable gentlemen to point to any instance where a man had held his seat

after expressing his intention to retire.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Sir Francis Hincks.

Mr. RICHARDS said that the case of Sir Francis Hincks was not a parallel one, because that gentleman was a member of the House and just as much a representative of the people as he (the speaker) was. A relative of his (the speaker's) who had been appointed a member of a Government went to a constituency and was defeated through the exertions made by the Conservatives. The honourable Commissioner of Crown Lands he believed took a hand in the work. He felt that whenever the whole power of a party who concentrated against one individual his defeat was generally secured, though he might retain the confidence of the people as a whole. Sir Francis had been defeated in Brant, but he was entitled to have a reasonable time allowed him in which to seek another constituency. He thought that what was right for an Opposition was right for a Government, and he was not one of that class of men whose politics depended upon whether they were in power or out of it. He had recently seen an account of a public dinner held in this city, at which the gentleman who stood behind the "powers that be" presided. The chairman of the meeting gave the toast of the Lieutenant-Governor, and stated that, although there had been grounds of complaint against that personage at one time, yet that one of his recent acts commended itself to the good opinion of those he addressed. The reason for this remark was the fact of a Judge leaving the judicial bench to become the leader of a party. He (the speaker) wondered if the drinking of such a toast depended upon whether recent acts had met with the approval of certain persons. The speaker went on to say that if the present Reform party had been formed like the old Reform party, he would have supported it; but he had noticed men who had opposed the Government of a man who had been a Reformer for thirty years in public life because he had two Conservatives in it, and then they themselves in their advent to power took in a gentleman who had also been a member of the Conservative party. When these gentlemen laid down rules which should guide them when in power as well as in Opposition, they might get Reform support. But they would have to be under a different leadership. They did not want to be governed by that institution in King-street controlled by an irresponsible party having no voice in the House. The Reform party, now so called, received no support from the members of the old Reform party.

Hon. Mr. MCKELLAR—They are all extinct. (Laughter.)

Mr. RICHARDS—The hon member himself was a converted Tory, and there were three or four more of them on the opposite benches. The speaker went on to repeat that whenever a member of a Government showed that he did not intend to remain in the House it was wrong for him to hold his seat; he ought to resign. In the case of the two honourable gentlemen to whom allusion had been made they decided that they would go to the House of Commons of Canada; and the moment they took that course they made their election. If the Premier could show him an instance where a gentleman had remained in the British Government after he had announced his intention of retiring altogether, then he would admit that his views were wrong. He however, felt certain that the resolution would not carry; the members who had cheered when the Premier was speaking were quite numerous enough to defeat the resolution of the hon. member for Lincoln; but still that did not change the question at all. The speaker concluded by alluding to the time when Responsible Government was being contended for, and said that the Commissioner of Crown Lands was probably opposed to the principle then, and he did not think that the honourable Premier at that period cast in his influence with the Reform party.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE, referring to the remarks of gentlemen opposite respecting Robert Baldwin, said they all had great respect for that gentleman; but the difference between them and gentlemen opposite was that they were carrying out the principles of Robert Baldwin while gentlemen opposite were departing from them. The hon. member for Niagara had said that he belonged to the class of politicians who always advocated the same principles, and yet he himself, while once a Reformer, was now a follower of one of the most extreme Conservatives in this country.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—I deny that I am a follower of any member of this House. (Cheers.) I recognize no leader, not even the hon. gentleman opposite.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE observed that in that