

ty. (Hear.) Mr. Cameron then referred to his speech on confederation, giving his reasons for opposing the scheme, and also quoted from THE GLOBE of 1853 and 1854, with a view to show that at that time a different view was entertained as to a union between the two parties of Conservatives and Reformers. He then said that the hon. gentleman who had been selected as the head of the Opposition was an able leader, although he had but a small following; but of what use was an able leader unless he had some ammunition? He could not do much, and he commiserated with him in his difficulty and misfortune. He believed that he (Mr. Blake) would find himself in a disagreeable position throughout the present session with regard to the question of arbitration. He thought that if the case of the Province had been in the hands of the hon. gentleman that he would have conducted his case in the manner most beneficial, in his opinion, to the Province of Ontario. The Province was represented by counsel not less distinguished than his hon. friend. (Mr. Blake—Hear.) Hon. Mr. Cameron said that that counsel was fully in accord with the Government in the course they had taken. He contended that the Hon. Treasurer was perfectly justified in the course he had taken. The allusion to the matter made by the hon. gentleman was unfortunate to both Provinces; because it had given the sanction of his name and of his position to the idea that there was a doubt as to whether that award was final or not. The hon. gentleman perhaps did not intend to give that effect to his words, but wise as he was, he sometimes made a mistake, and on this occasion he had blundered most unfortunately. It was not the intention of the Government to have made any more allusion to the question than was made in the speech. They desired that any difficulties that might arise between the two Provinces should be settled amicably, and that as little irritation should be given to the Province of Quebec as possible. (Hear.) The Government desired that the Union which had been formed between Quebec and Ontario should be a Union heart and soul. They did not consider that the award was anything more than justice, if it was scarcely that. The hon. members for North Perth, South Bruce and Grey were all deeply interested in the settlement of the Land Improvement Fund, and it was in the interest of the settlement of that fund that the award should be made as quickly as possible. It was in the interest of the Province at large that we should know as nearly as possible what our obligations were, and what were the means they would have at their disposal for the necessities of the Government and the improvement of the country. Everything that could be done to obtain that decision speedily was done, and the Treasurer's ability and knowledge of the whole question had aided very materially in its early settlement. It was unfortunate that the Province of Quebec should take the course it had in claiming the right of their arbitrator to withdraw; but Judge Day acquiesced in the decision of the other arbitrators, though he intimated, at the same time, that its official announcement would lead to his withdrawal from the arbitration. But did the hon. gentleman suppose that if the arbitration had proceeded, and the principle in dispute had been asserted at its close, there would have been less or no dissatisfaction among the people of Quebec—(hear)—and that there would have been any more moral force attached to the decision? The hon. gentleman had blamed the Dominion Government for appointing Colonel Gray, although that hon. gentleman had decided too favourably, it was said, for this Province.

Mr. BLAKE said he blamed the Government for appointing Col. Gray to a commissionership, and not as arbitrator.

Mr. CAMERON said his hon. friend was attacking some members of the Provincial Government for voting against his Bill, which would have prevented Col. Gray from accepting the office of arbitrator.

Mr. BLAKE.—The office of commissioner.

Mr. CAMERON.—I do not see what that can have to do with this question—and how the action of this Government in that matter can have anything to do with the Address we are now considering?

Mr. BLAKE.—I will show you.

Mr. CAMERON contended that this action of the Opposition leader was a bid for French support in the Dominion Legislature. At least that would be a fair insinuation if he was to be judged by the standard which he applied to others. (Hear.) He thought the country would not endorse the factious conduct of the hon. gentlemen opposite. As to the alleged omission charged against the

Government by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee), they had not alluded in the Address to the question of Municipal Law Consolidation, because the Government could not claim any very great credit for it. The hon. members for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and for South Perth (Mr. Trow), having especially studied the subject, the Government had placed a notice on the paper for the introduction of a Bill for the consolidation of the Municipal Law. They had also adopted the Bill for the trial of controverted elections, after having seen its working in England, and having successfully overcome some of the difficulties which stood in the way of its adoption last session. Mr. Cameron concluded by attempting to refute the remarks of Mr. McKellar that the Government deserved no credit for the surplus on the ground that the expenses of the Governmental machinery here was not greater than in the less populated Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE and Mr. FERGUSON rose together, and the latter having obtained the floor, proceeded.

Mr. BLAKE, after one or two introductory remarks, proceeded to refer to the speech of the Hon. Secretary. He said: that the Provincial Secretary no doubt felt it a very gratifying thing to read from the columns of newspapers of years past to justify himself in his new position. But what was the attitude of the gentleman to his leader in 1863 and 1864? Did he not move an amendment against his leader? He did do so, and he (Mr. Blake) was glad to say that the Liberals of that day, as now, were true to their principles, and voted against the Government on Hon. Mr. Cameron's motion. This was the man, forsooth, who turned to the newspapers of fourteen years ago to show that party spirit was an evil thing. The gentleman had also read some extracts to show that there was no difference between Conservatives and Reformers. He (Mr. Blake) would appeal to gentlemen opposite to correct their colleague, for did not the Treasurer say yesterday that it would be easier to create a new universe than turn him into a Tory? (Roars of laughter.) There was another point which he (Mr. Blake) would desire to have cleared up. The Provincial Secretary had stated that it was but just to increase the subsidy of Nova Scotia, while the Treasurer maintained that it was not. How was this difference to be accounted for?

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said he had stated that if the opinion of the member for Bothwell were correct, an injustice had been done to Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAKE said that the Provincial Secretary had stated that the Union Act would inflict injustice on Ontario. Was it not injustice when the money of Ontario was taken away and given to Nova Scotia? And did not Hon. Mr. Cameron defend the subsidy to Nova Scotia? That hon. gentleman had referred to the Controverted Elections Bill. He (Mr. Blake) could assert that it was not a copy of the English Act, for the English Act was rather a confused specimen of legislation, and he (Mr. Blake) had made several alterations in it. The Opposition did not say that they were originating some things unknown to the rest of the world; but they did say they brought forward some things theoretically well calculated to remove certain evils. He held that it was proper to introduce a measure that would be suitable to the circumstances of the country, whether the measure originated in any other country or not. He would now refer to a matter which was not at all personal to himself. He referred to the conduct of the member for North Leeds and Grenville. He (Mr. Blake) could not see what in the world the alleged conversation between that gentleman and the Hon. George Brown had to do with the matter discussed by Mr. McKellar. How the member for North Leeds could have derived that information, except in the course of a confidential communication, it was impossible to conceive. It was quite obvious, from the very statement of the member for North Leeds and Grenville, that he must have committed a gross breach of confidence in alluding to it at all. He (Mr. Blake) would now read to the House a letter he had to-day received from the Hon. George Brown on the subject. It was as follows:—

TORONTO, 9th Dec., 1870.

MY DEAR SIR—I have read with indignation—I cannot say with astonishment—the statement made by Mr. H. D. Smith in the House of Assembly, last night, that he saw in my office and in my hands, in 1867, a note made by Mr. McKellar for \$1,000, which was for Mr. McKellar's election expenses, and had been sent to me for my endorsement.

Will you oblige me by taking an oppor-

tunity of saying in the House to-night that Mr. Smith's statement is pure fabrication. I had the honour of several visits from Mr. Smith at the time of the last election—though not a little amazed that he should venture to make reference to them—but he saw no note either in my hands or on my desk. Mr. McKellar asked me for no pecuniary assistance at last election, either by endorsement or otherwise. I had no note in 1867 in my possession for \$1,000, either made by Mr. McKellar or by anybody else, for election expenses. I was not asked to endorse any such note.

Perhaps you will not object to add that had my old and warmly-esteemed friend Mr. McKellar stood in need of assistance in the contest of 1867, it would have been precisely the right thing on his part to let me know of it; and assuredly the exchequer must have been very low indeed if I had not found what he wanted.

Yours faithfully,

GEO. BROWN.

EDWARD BLAKE, ESQ.,
&c., &c.

He (Mr. Blake) would take leave of this unpleasant matter by saying that since the member for North Leeds and Grenville had chosen to reveal private conversation, he would have done better to have made a clean breast of it, and have told whether his communications to Hon. George Brown were entirely consistent with the course he had since pursued. (Loud cheers.) He would now leave Mr. Smith for the present, for it was unpleasant to be long in his company. (Laughter.) The member for South Grey, (Mr. Lauder), said that he (Mr. Blake) had behaved extremely ill to him, because that on a former occasion he (Mr. Blake), while making a motion with reference to offices of profit, had a communication with that member at his desk, and told him that he did not consider his (Mr. Lauder's) office as one of profit. Now he (Mr. Blake) had scrupulously abstained from making any allusion to any individual at all; for it was his desire to put his motion on general principles. But that forbearance on his part was rewarded by an onslaught by the Attorney-General, who said that his motion was an invidious attack on some members of the House, mentioning Mr. Lauder among them. He (Mr. Blake) had asked the member for Grey if he were receiving any emolument as a trustee; if so, he would be embraced in the terms of the motion; if not, he would not come within its scope. The member for Grey said he was not receiving any emolument.

Mr. LAUDER—No.

Mr. BLAKE said that the speech made by the member for Grey, last night, proved that he (Mr. Blake) was right in what he had just stated. Now he (Mr. Blake) would predict that a handsome sum would be given to the gentlemen who were trustees of railways, of whom the member for Grey was one; he was now satisfied that at the time he had spoken to Mr. Lauder the latter was expecting to get some sort of reward. It had been stated that a partner in the firm of which he (Mr. Blake) was a member had been made Master in Chancery. But the Attorney-General would bear him (Mr. Blake) out in the statement that he knew nothing of the intended appointment until it had been some days in the hands of Mr. Boyd, his partner, and had been accepted by that gentleman. After stating that he would have great pleasure in meeting the member for Grey, in that county at the next election, and would be glad to meet that gentleman in South Bruce, Mr. Blake proceeded to reply to the remarks that had been made on that part of his speech of the day previous in which he alluded to the arbitration question. He would now re-state what he had said, namely, that by the Legislature and public men of the Province of Quebec objection was taken to the award—the first objection being that the award was defective in point of law, by reason of the secession of Judge Day and the counsel for the Province of Quebec, and lessened in its moral weight by that circumstance; second, that it was lessened in its moral weight by the status of Col. Gray, who was the pensioner of Sir John A. Macdonald. Having stated what was notorious and perfectly well known as the grounds of objection to the award, he (Mr. Blake) had proceeded to point out the extent to which this Government was responsible for the award being liable to those objections. He had expressed no opinion as to the validity or force of the objections. He (Mr. Blake) had stated that the Quebec Government were aware informally of what the decision was about to be, and took the steps they did before it was pro-