

continued. The hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands in particular had gone back, as usual, to the taking of Quebec by Wolfe, and raked up all the precedents he could find to continue a principle which tended strongly to subvert the independence of the House. He (Mr. O.) would support the resolutions of the hon. member for South Bruce.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS said he did not consider these resolutions were throwing any discredit on the hon. member for Leeds, or the hon. member for Grey. The principle they contained was a good one, and would receive his support.

Mr. BLAKE did not intend in these resolutions, or his remarks thereon, to point particularly to the hon. member for Leeds. No doubt, he (Mr. B.) had referred to his holding an office under Government, but it was the hon. Attorney General who spoke of it as a position of emolument. He (Mr. B.) did not allude to it in that light at all.

Atty-General MACDONALD—But THE GLOBE did.

Mr. BLAKE wished to remind his hon. friend that it was not THE GLOBE that was now speaking.

Attorney-General MACDONALD—I'm not so sure of that.

Mr. BLAKE reminded the hon. gentleman that at one time he had himself sat in a Government under the leadership of the proprietor of that journal. With regard to the question, he had brought no charge against this Government. They had acted under an existing law, and he did not blame them for it, but he condemned the principle. He had no doubt the hon. member for South Leeds felt sorry that he had accepted the office. It was unfortunate for the hon. gentleman that he had received the appointment at the time he had changed his views. He (Mr. B.) did not condemn anything that had been done in the past, but were we never to advance? Were we to remain stationary forever? It was asserted by the hon. members opposite, that this had only re-enacted the old law of 1848; but public opinion had advanced, and required an improvement on that old law. Experience had proved that the law of 1848 was a bad one, and that many abuses existed under it. The tendency of legislation was to limit the number of paid servants of the Crown who could hold seats in this House, and it was therefore retrograding to revive the old law of 1848. The Hon. Provincial Secretary complained that he (Mr. B.) was only theorizing. Only the other day he brought in a matter of practical legislation, and the hon. gentleman opposed it. It was impossible to please the hon. Provincial Secretary for whether he (Mr. B.) theorized or introduced practical measures, the hon. member condemned him. (Cries of six o'clock.)

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. BLAKE resumed. He said that it had been urged that the analogies he had made were not appropriate. He had referred to the case of registrars, and he had said that he thought they held at the pleasure of the Government, although the fees of the office were not received from the Crown. It was held that the simple fact that the officer was thus under the authority of the Government was sufficient to bar his admission to the House. But take the case of the Crown counsel. The country had to expend certain money in Crown counsel business. Certain criminal cases were to be tried, and certain Queen's counsel had to be appointed; but it was held that no Queen's counsel, being a member of Parliament, could hold this office. And why? Because they received a pecuniary favour. And this was a temporary case; he was simply given an Assize, and there was an end of the occupation—there was end of the favour of the Crown; but yet it was held that the Government had no right to give it to a member of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON—I may mention that it is in the power of the Government to increase the fees of the Crown officer.

Mr. BLAKE said it might be in the power of the Government; but they also knew that certain regulations were observed in the case of Crown counsel. In that case it seemed to him that the Government, seeing that the Crown had practically nothing to do with the fees dispensed, simply appointed a man who should make this profit; and the law said that the man who should be appointed to this place of profit should not be elected a member of the Legislature.

Atty-General MACDONALD—How about the magistrates?

Mr. BLAKE was perfectly aware that magistrates were appointed, and that they received fees; but did the hon. gentleman mean to say that that was right?

Atty-General MACDONALD—Yes. Right.

Mr. BLAKE said he supposed he wished him to include these gentlemen in the resolution. It seemed to him that it was impossible to contend against the proposition that the power which the Crown could exercise in this matter, was calculated to impair the independence of the House just as much as those which the Crown was forbidden to exercise. The Crown had been rightly forbidden to give other offices and employment to members of Parliament because it tended to impair their independence, not because, as the Hon. Commissioner had said, that they must necessarily vote wrong, but because it might tend to produce that result, that it might chance to produce this result. The principle he supported was that the Government should have the power of influencing the members of the House; whether the emolument was payable by the Government or not, was immaterial. He ventured to hope that the opinions of those who had suggested that this was a vote of censure upon the Government, would not prevail; at any rate, he did not believe that it would prevail in the country. He believed that his motion would be received as it was put, viz: as a motion to assert the view that it was not fair that these things should continue. He hoped that the matter would go in this light to the country.

Mr. CARNEGIE said although the registrars received their fees from the public, yet they were appointed for life, but could be removed at the pleasure of the Government. Therefore the Government could always hold this dismissal as a whip over the head of such an official. The other case, of Queen's counsel, although they were appointed solely for the Assizes, yet the appointments were

made, year after year, at the discretion of the Government; and the same argument would also apply in their case.

Mr. McKELLAR regretted exceedingly that the Government should have thought it directed against the two hon. members alluded to. The hon. member for South Bruce had not alluded to them.

Atty-General MACDONALD—Yes he did to the member for South Leeds.

Mr. McKELLAR said if he had done so, it was to the member who held an appointment, and who was in receipt of emoluments. He thought that if there was any subject which the House should deal with, it was that of preventing the employment of members of this House by the Government. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had gone back some ten years to trace up the history of the country, to show that he, himself, had always been a consistent Reformer. That was altogether aside from the question under discussion; but he hoped, that there were very few such Reformers as the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, at the present day. Now, as for the Attorney-General, the hon. gentleman arose here, and told the House that the vote was one of want of confidence in the Government. Whether it was or not, it was a proper one to discuss and vote upon. But the House would have an opportunity of seeing the efforts of the Patent Combination to assure themselves from defeat. He had pursued the same course—he had taken the initiative of assuring himself from defeat, and he had moved the six month's hoist, and if that failed, he had an invention at hand by which he could turn round and save himself. There was no difference in their being defeated,—it was all the same, for they possessed an invention which would always keep them in power for ever. It simply was—to move a six month's hoist, and if that was lost, to turn round and support the motion and keep your seats (Cheers and laughter.) He should vote for this motion and for any motion that would deprive the members of this Government, or any Government of any power by which they could exercise influence over the members of this House. It was contrary to human nature to say that if powers were conferred upon them, if offices of care were given to them by which they derived profit, they

would not sympathize and support these gentlemen who had given them these offices. He thought that the hon. gentleman had been very unfortunate in the illustration that he had given of Mr. Gladstone having been appointed by the Imperial Government. In the first place, he received no pay for those services, and was a man eminently qualified for the services that he had performed.

Atty-General MACDONALD—And the hon. member for South Leeds was not?

Mr. McKELLAR said he did not suppose that that hon. gentleman would say that he was eminently qualified for his duties above his fellows as was Mr. Gladstone for his. It happened that that gentleman was all that time the leader of the Opposition at the time he was appointed, and it also happened in this case that the hon. member for Leeds had gone over "body, bone and breeches," before he received the appointment, and had voted for the Government. He only desired to see it go to the country, and let the country judge whether his hon. friend's resolution was a proper one, and whether the opposition which the Government would give to them should be approved by the people. (Cheers.)

Mr. LOUNT said the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat had expressed his willingness to be judged by the country. So did he (Mr. L.) desire to have his course criticized by the country, but before closing the discussion he desired to show the sophistry with which the invidious attack of the hon. members opposite was covered. It was not the principle which they opposed, it was an underhand attack on the Government. Now what was the professed style of these resolutions? It was to prevent hon. members from receiving positions of emolument under Government. He did not think that the position of an arbitrator outside of the House could in any way interfere with the independence of that member inside the House. The hon. member for Bruce should have constructed his resolutions in such a way as to prevent the members of this House from receiving their usual allowance of stationery, etc. every Session; he should have prevented relatives, cousins, wives and all having connection with members of this House (laughter) from receiving offices under Government. He would vote for the amendment.

Messrs. BAXTER and SEXTON followed and the amendment was carried on the following division:—

YEAS—Messrs. Barber, Beatty, Boulter, Calvin, Cameron, Cairng, (London), Carraige, Cockburn, Code, Colquhoun, Corby, Craig, Glengarry, Craig (Russell), Cumberland, Currie, Grahame (York), Hays, Hooper, Lauder, Lount, Lyon, Macdonald, Matchett, Monteith, Read, Richards, Rykert, Secord, Smith, (Kent), Smith, (Leeds and Grenville), Strange, Tett, Wallis, Wigle, Wilson, Wood—37.

NAYS—Messrs. Baxter, Blake, Boyd, Christie, Evans, Fitzsimmons, Fraser, Galbraith, Gow, McCall, (Norfolk), McKellar, McKim, McMurrich, Oliver, Pardee, Perry, Sexton, Sinclair, Springer, Trow, Williams, (Hamilton)—21.

Mr. BLAKE moved the second resolution, and said it was not consistent with the maintenance of this House that any member of it should receive contracts from Government. It appeared from a statement made before his constituents by the hon. member for Halton that he had received a contract from Government and entered into it without thinking or without caring how it damaged his position in the House. His circumstances were such that the value received would not effect his vote in the House. But it was a violation of a sound principle, and the hon. leader of the Government told the member for Halton that he should support this Government because he used his blankets and paper.

Atty-General MACDONALD—I was only joking.

Mr. BLAKE said he knew his hon. friend would try to excuse himself on that score, but it would not do. People did not joke in a passion, as the hon. leader of the Government undoubtedly was when he spoke to Mr. Barber. That the contract did not affect Mr. Barber's vote the result showed, but still he (Mr. Blake) felt it his duty to try and place it beyond the possibility of any leader of a Government in this House from

trying to influence the vote of any member of this House by such means, and to wipe out the possibility of a recurrence of such an insult as had been offered to the hon. member for Halton by the hon. Atty-General. He, therefore, moved the second resolution.

Atty-General MACDONALD—"Thope you're relieved."

The motion having been read, Mr. BARBER said this was a cry for very little wool. (Laughter.) He never knew he owed the contract for the blankets to the Attorney-General. He (Mr. B.) had supplied the Lunatic Asylum with blankets for years. It was no new thing. About the paper, his (Mr. Barber's) brother got the contract to supply the Ottawa Government with paper, and there was nothing to be concealed in the matter. He (Mr. B.) had no interest in the business whatever. Then about this attempt to influence his vote, there was only one occasion on which the Attorney-General had occasion to him about it. It was on the question of dual representation, and he believed the hon. leader of the Government was vexed at the time, and "pitched into" him as being the most convenient person. He (Mr. Barber) got "his ent Irish" up, and gave the hon. gentleman more than his own (laughter); and, indeed, it was a question whether the Attorney-General or himself had more cause to be sorry for the incident.

Atty-General MACDONALD said the hon. member for South Bruce, while pretending to have the interests of the House at heart, was simply intermeddling with affairs which did not require his interference. The political atmosphere of this country was too foul for the hon. gentleman, and he was always endeavouring to purge it. He was always wearying the House with speeches as long as a Mackinaw blanket (laughter) on subjects of no possible use to the country. He was wasting the time of the House, spreading himself to cut a figure before the country. He sang the song, and his worthy colleague, the hon. member for Bothwell, sang the chorus. (Laughter.) They claimed to be the purest and the best, and charged everyone opposed to them with being corrupt and unfit to legislate for the country. He denounced the policy of the hon. members opposite, which, he said, was to waste the valuable time of the House with buncombe measures and long buncombe speeches.

Mr. PARDEE said if the hon. member for Bruce occupied the time of the House, he, at least, spoke sense, and advocated sound principles. This resolution was no buncombe measure. The principle embodied in it was sound, and should be supported by every hon. member who wished to maintain the independence of the House.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said a law already existed to prevent hon. members of the House from accepting contracts from Government. Then what was the use of bringing up this resolution. If it passed they could only affirm a principle already established. No, the object of the hon. member opposite was to raise a cry at the next election. They wished to point to this vote and say, see how these Government supporters wish to subvert the independence of Parliament. He (Mr. C.) would therefore move that all after the word "that" in the resolution be struck out, and the following substituted:—"In the opinion of this House the independence of this House and the public interests are sufficiently protected by the Act to secure the independence of the Legislative Assembly."

Mr. BLAKE said if the present law covered the case the hon. member for Halton had committed a breach of the law, and had no right to sit in this House. But he (Mr. B.) did not consider that the Act extended far enough. The hon. members opposite seemed to think that the morality of giving a contract depended on the length of time to which the contract extended. It mattered not whether it was an isolated bargain or a contract extending over years. The principle was the same in each case, and such a course was likely to subvert the independence of members of this House.

Mr. CUMBERLAND would be sorry to think that the independence of Parliament could be influenced by transactions outside the House. He considered it a slur on every member in the House to insinuate such a thing.

A division was taken on the amendment, which was carried:—

YEAS—Beatty, Boulter, Calvin, Cameron, Cairng, (London), Carnegie, Cockburn, Code, Colquhoun, Corby, Craig (Glengarry), Craig (Russell), Cumberland, Currie, Grahame (York), Hays, Hooper, Lauder, Lount, Lyon, Macdonald, Matchett, Monteith, McCall (Norfolk), Read, Richards, Rykert, Scott (Grey), Secord, Smith (Kent), Smith (Leeds), Strange, Tett, Wallis, Wigle, Wilson, Wood—37.

NAYS—Barber, Baxter, Blake, Boyd, Christie, Evans, Fitzsimmons, Fraser, Galbraith, Gow, McKellar, McKim, McMurrich, Oliver, Pardee, Perry, Sexton, Sinclair, Springer, Trow, Williams (Hamilton)—21.

Mr. BLAKE then moved the third resolution. He said this resolution did not affect the independence of the House directly, but it was calculated to affect it otherwise. If constituencies were to be bribed to send supporters of the Government by offers of local improvements, there was a danger of affecting the independence of Parliament. He referred to the speeches of the Attorney-General at Hamilton and at Brooklyn. (Here he read extracts from the Attorney-General's speech at the latter place.) But, besides these two speeches, other members in the House had mentioned the benefits which would be derived from supporting the Government. If this were to be the course pursued by the Administration of the day, then it was time for all honest men to let politics alone. In the case of the Belleville Asylum, every report concerning it had shown that it was a reward to that constituency for the faithful support which its representative had given the Government. No doubt the hon. gentleman had given a uniform support to the Government, and it was mainly for this reason that Belleville had received the Asylum, and it was because Hamilton had returned an opponent to the Government that the public money had not been expended there. The only argument advanced for establishing the Asylum at Belleville was that it was a central position. But it really was not a central position. Having regard to population

it was to the eastward, for three-fourths of the population of Ontario were to the west, and one-fourth to the east of that town. But he did not wish the discussion to descend to the merits of the rival towns. The principle which he desired to establish was that the site should have been chosen on its own merits alone, not on account of the political opinions existing in the locality.

Mr. CORBY indignantly denied the statement of the hon. member opposite that the members for Hastings had been influenced to support the Government by the establishment of the Asylum at Belleville. He quoted from THE GLOBE a report of a speech delivered on the 5th November, in which this charge was made, when he (Mr. Corby) was absent. He denied that charge. It was an utter falsehood. The hon. members opposite were always preaching about economical Government, and yet they were the most expensive material in the House. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Bruce, and his worthy associate the hon. member for Prescott, with their buncombe speeches, reminded him of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza attacking the windmill. (Laughter.) He would act independently in spite of the howlings of the hon. members opposite. He was elected to give the Government an honest support, and he would do it. His votes had been straightforward and honest. He had never attacked an hon. member opposite, but he would remind them if they attacked himself, he would retaliate. (Applause.)

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said the few observations he had made in Belleville had given the honourable member for South Bruce an opportunity of making two or three speeches this session. The reason Hamilton did not receive the Asylum was that it was not a suitable site for it. It was necessary to find some site, and the most central should be chosen. Belleville was selected for this reason, and it was never intimated to the people of that section that the Asylum was given them for past support, or as a bribe for future aid. The hon. member for Bruce had tried to prove that Belleville was not central if population were to be considered, but he would remind the hon. member that the back country was being rapidly settled up, and before long it would be the centre as regarded population as well as its position. He would request the hon. members opposite to find some fault of the Government to complain of, and not attack them for what they might possibly do in the future.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Hamilton) wished to know why the Asylum was removed from Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said it was because Hamilton was found to be unhealthy and in many respects an unfit place for the Asylum. Belleville was selected because it was a better location in every respect.

Mr. WILLIAMS said the Asylum had been removed from Toronto to Hamilton in the first place, because Hamilton was a better site for it. It could not be complained that a site could not be found for it there, because last session he offered fifty acres of land for the purpose. No, the Asylum had not been removed from Hamilton because it was not a fit place, but because it did not return a supporter of the Government to Parliament. He considered it one of the most disgraceful acts of which any Government ever was or ever could be guilty.

Mr. McCALL (Norfolk) supported the resolution, on the ground that the removal of the Asylum had been made for political reasons.

Mr. FRASER knew of no act of the present Administration which had met with such universal condemnation as the removal of the Asylum from Hamilton. The country regarded it not only as an act of injustice, but the whole affair reflected great discredit on the Administration of the day. With respect to the charge made against the hon. member for South Bruce, that he wasted the time of the House with useless speeches on mere theories, he contended that the hon. member was one of the most useful in the House, and that he was looked up to by the country at large as a man of whom any country might be proud.

Mr. SINCLAIR said the tendency of such speeches as those of the hon. Attorney-General at Hamilton and Brooklyn, and of the Provincial Secretary at Belleville, were calculated to corrupt constituencies more than anything else. People should not tolerate such an insult as was offered to the people of Hamilton by the hon. Attorney-General, and the subsequent injury done the city because its representative refused to support the Government. He (Mr. S.) desired to enter his protest against such an unfair course as had been pursued by the Government in this, and he hoped the House would adopt this resolution and prevent a future recurrence of such disgraceful proceedings.

Mr. COCKBURN said the hon. member for South Bruce had referred to him, and made a quotation from certain letters which were written by him (Mr. Cockburn) during the controversy with the press, last winter, when he had been unfairly charged with sordid motives in giving certain support to the Administration. The quotation made by the hon. member was correct, but was surrounded by other observations, such as that he (Mr. Cockburn) had not been elected as an out-and-out opponent of the Government, which, he asserted, was bringing down many good and useful measures; that the country was progressing under the present rule, and that in consideration of all this, and with the large and much-needed expenditures referred to, he had been influenced in giving the Government the benefit of any doubts. He always listened with interest to the able speeches of the hon. member for South Bruce; but he desired to be fairly represented, and courted the fullest enquiry into all his acts.

Atty-General MACDONALD said a great deal had been made out of his speech at Brooklyn, but he would be bound to say he was more popular in that place than any of the hon. gentlemen who condemned him. The people did not approve of this attempt to make a member a blind follower of any party. Now, respecting this Asylum, he considered that when Government was entrusted with \$75,000, they should be allowed to say where it was to be expended. The hon. member for Hamilton had seen fit to