

to the one now in power. At any rate let them get back to honest administration and political principle.

Mr. SMITH (Leeds) offered some personal explanations with regard to his position. He was elected to give the Government a fair trial, and he had done so. With regard to the appointments he had received, they were worth but \$413; and he thought he had rather conferred a favour on the Government in accepting them than placed himself under any obligations. (Laughter.) He would, however, make one statement in reply to this attack of the hon. member for Bothwell. He would like to ask the hon. gentleman about a note for \$1000 which he (Mr. Smith) saw lying on the desk of a gentleman, who, holding it up, said, "If I endorse that I shall have to pay it."

Mr. McKELLAR—I am sure I never sent such a note. Give us the name and all about it.

Mr. SMITH—I have only to say that the Hon. Geo. Brown had such a note previous to last election. It was to pay for election expenses. (Oh.)

Mr. McKELLAR—I deny it. (Loud cries of "Hear.")

Mr. SMITH—I challenge the Hon. Geo. Brown to deny it. I state it on my veracity—all I say is that I saw the note with the name on it.

Mr. McKELLAR—All I have to say is that I never sent such a note.

Mr. SMITH—This is a very unpleasant matter, and I regret that the hon. gentleman has forced me to make this disclosure.

Mr. McKELLAR—Well, I never sent such a note—the charge is entirely untrue.

Mr. SMITH then proceeded with his remarks, claiming that he supported squarely, and that he believed the people would re-elect him.

Mr. MAGILL said he considered that the speech from the Throne was a model speech. As to the arbitration he feared from the spirit shown by the people of Quebec, that it would be some years before the people of Ontario would realize fully all the advantages that would arise from a settlement of this great question. Mr. Magill went on to comment favourably on the several paragraphs of the speech.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS proceeded to explain the circumstances under which the Mineral Bill was introduced, and the reasons why it was repealed. The government had heard that there were very valuable mineral discoveries in the Lake Superior region, and thought it was but right that a royalty should be exacted. They then introduced the Bill, but the Government found that the reports of the mineral wealth had been exaggerated, and repealed the Bill. He then proceeded to defend the policy of the Government in the matter of the free grants, which he characterized as a sound, honest, liberal and just one. He referred to the remarks which had been made on the appointment of Mr. Smith, of North Leeds, and contended it was perfectly legal, for it was not an office under the crown. To his (Mr. Richards') certain knowledge the Hon. Robert Baldwin was in the habit of making selections from members of the House to perform the duties of Queen's Counsel. The Government had a perfect right to exercise their patronage in the appointment of Mr. Smith. Mr. Richards then went on to defend the policy of the Government on the arbitration question.

Mr. PARDEE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. M. C. CAMERON moved the adjournment of the House.

The House rose at ten minutes to twelve o'clock.

TORONTO, Dec. 9.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:20 p.m.

#### PETITIONS.

The following petitions were presented:—

Mr. Clemens—From the Agricultural Society of the South Riding Electoral Division of Waterloo, praying that the mode of election in electoral county Agricultural Societies may be more clearly defined.

Mr. Cockburn—From the township council of Monck, praying that all arrears on Government lands may be cancelled and patents issued to settlers in that district.

Mr. McColl (Elgin)—From the County Council of Elgin, praying for certain amendments in the Act relating to juries. (2.)

Mr. Anderson—From D. M. Lake and others of Marysburgh, praying for the repeal of the Act separating the township of Marysburgh into two municipalities.

Mr. Currie—From West Middlesex Agricultural Society, for an Act to enable them to sell certain lots, and to confirm sales already made.

Mr. PARDEE resumed the debate on the address. He said he had thought yesterday that the debate was likely to be closed after the speech from the leader of the Opposition and the members of the Government. But perhaps it was just as well that it did not close, for it was found that when the opportunity arose a large number of members on both sides desired to utter their opinions. It was very desirable, however, that the discussion on the address should be carried on in an upright manner, and that the members of the House should discuss public utterances and leave private matters and private utterances alone. (Hear, hear.) He considered that when they departed from this wholesome rule they departed from the dignity of the House and lowered the standard of debate. (Hear, hear.) He observed yesterday a noticeable instance of a departure from this rule.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I noticed it plainly.

Mr. PARDEE said he referred to some remarks which had fallen from a gentleman who originally came from the same part of the country as himself, and for whom he had the highest respect personally, and in whom, up to a very recent time, he had confidence politically. He referred to the member for North Leeds, (Mr. Smith.) The member for Leeds had referred to a private conversation alleged to have taken place between the member for Bothwell (Mr. McKellar) and the Hon. George Brown. He had alluded to a matter strictly private in its nature and character, and to a conversation that had taken place between two individuals, neither of whom at that time, had a seat in this House. (Hear, hear.) What took place between these two individuals was not a matter of public importance, and should not have been repeated in this House. (Hear, hear.) Admitting that all the member for North Leeds said was true, was there anything which any man had reason to be ashamed of? Was it not perfectly legitimate that the hon. member for Bothwell should endorse a note for the Hon. George Brown, and vice versa? (Hear, hear.) Was there any man in this House who had not asked some person or other to accommodate him in that way? Was there anything dishonourable that a note for election expenses should be paid? The payment of election expenses was just as honourable as the payment of any other debt. He (Mr. Pardee) regretted that the member for North Leeds should have reported this private conversation; and hoped he (Mr. Pardee) would not have occasion to refer to a matter of this kind hereafter. (Hear, hear.) He was quite willing to admit that gentlemen on his side had sometimes referred to conversations outside the House, but he believed they only referred to them when they took place with gentlemen occupying a public position, and when they had reference to public matters. The member for Bothwell, in his speech last night, did refer to a conversation that was alleged to have taken place between the Attorney-General and some other party. But it should be remembered that the Attorney-General occupied a public position, and that the conversation related to a public matter. The two cases, therefore, were not parallel. He (Mr. Pardee) would wish to refer to the speech that had been made by the Treasurer. That gentleman had made a charge against members on this side which was not correct. He had alleged that members on this side were in the habit of following their leaders, and with voting whatever way they told them, regardless of their own opinions. This charge was incorrect. If the Reformers erred in anything, it was because they were in the habit of acting on their own individual judgment. The contrary was the case with gentlemen on the other side; and he would give one instance of it. (Hear, hear.) On the 13th resolution of the Nova Scotia resolutions, when the vote was taken, there was a majority on that side of the House against the amendment moved by the Provincial Secretary. They then voted according to their consciences; but immediately afterwards, when the question was put again, they voted in a contrary direction, and he supposed they did so at the instance of the Attorney-General. (Hear, hear.) If a glaring instance of that kind could be directed against members on this side of the House, he would admit that they did follow their leaders. The Treasurer sought to make a strong point against the leader of the Opposi-

tion, because he had said that the Provincial Government should have arrived at certain details before they proceeded to the question at issue. He (Mr. Pardee) asserted that the leader of the Opposition did not question the finality of the arbitration; on the contrary, he stated that he considered it was finally settled, so far as it could be settled up to the present time. He did not assert that Upper Canada had received any injustice, or that there was any chance of the arbitration being reopened. Now, supposing, as the Treasurer stated, that the newspapers of Lower Canada should take that up, was there anything in connection with the arbitration which we desired to keep secret? (Hear, hear.) He contended that the only way we could finally settle all public matters was to have the fullest and most complete discussion possible; and if we undertook to conceal from Lower Canada—if we in Upper Canada were afraid to discuss the principles on which this arbitration was carried out, we would encourage Lower Canada to find fault with the results of the arbitration. (Hear, hear.) If the arbitrators did err in some preliminary steps, was it not more manly for us to point it out than to conceal it? (Hear.) We did not point these things out with the view of raising hopes in Lower Canada that the results of that arbitration would be upset, but to show to the Government that if they had adopted a different course the agitation on the subject in Lower Canada would not exist. (Hear, hear.) The Reformers accepted the arbitration as a finality, as far as it was possible to accept it. (Hear, hear.) They also knew that the leading newspapers of the Reform party so accepted it; and he had not yet heard of a single individual on this side of the House, or on the other, who did not believe that substantial justice had been done to Lower Canada. The belief was general that practical justice had been done to Lower Canada, and he hoped the matter was finally settled. With regard to the address, he would ask the House to remember that it was understood last session that the Ministry would have ready for this session a measure for the consolidation of the municipal laws of the Province. There was nothing about this in the address, and he was greatly disappointed at it. (Hear, hear.) As our municipal laws now stood, it was almost impossible for any man to tell what they were, and it was an oversight and a neglect of duty on the part of the government not to have carried out what was implied in respect to these laws last session. (Hear, hear.) As to that part of the address which referred to the subject of immigration, he would observe that the policy of the Government had not satisfied the demands of the country. The country would not be satisfied with a half-penny, peddling policy; it wanted a broad measure; it demanded the opening up of the North-West by the establishment of railway communication direct between Canada and some point in that country. Let this question of railway communication with the North-West be agitated, and ere long it would be an accomplished fact. He regretted that the speech should have been so indefinite with respect to the surplus money and its application for certain railways. He held it was desirable to open up the country by railways, but they should be built on sound commercial principles. He hoped the Government would not ask the House to vote amounts of money to distribute to railways in favoured localities; he hoped the House would not be asked to give four or five thousand dollars a mile to railways which only ran through sections whose representatives were supporters of the Government. (Hear, hear.) After twitting the member for Welland (Mr. Beatty) for his affectation of independence, Mr. Pardee proceeded to say that he believed in party; but did not believe in faction. He believed it to be in the interests of the country that we should strain a point in order to keep up party, for it was the only way in which we could have a healthy Opposition. (Applause.)

Mr. LAUDER, referring to the arbitration matter, said the whole question turned upon the preliminary decision, and he contended that the member for South Bruce, in objecting to that preliminary decision, endorsed the course taken by Quebec. He had hoped that Ontario would be united as one man to support the arbitrators; but he was very sorry to find that the course taken by Quebec was endorsed by some of our prominent men, as the member for South Bruce had done. He believed that honourable gentleman was actuated by a desire to discharge his duty to the country in so doing, but that he had erred in judgment, and would one day think so himself, just as he