

12
This was not what he called Reform. (Roars of laughter.)

It now being six o'clock the House rose for recess.

After recess,

Mr. CALVIN resumed his remarks. He thought that no measures should be proposed unless the people said they wanted them. He did not think that agriculture should be introduced into the common schools; for a boy who was a farmer's son would learn far more from his father than he would in a school where the master knew nothing at all about agriculture. He was glad that the Treasurer said that the finances were in a prosperous condition; but many in the House knew as much about the finances as the Treasurer did. (Laughter.) As long as we had enough of trees, so long the Yankees would be after them, and the Treasury would be full, and we would not want money for the next twenty years. If the license system went on, our woods would not have enough pine wood twenty years from now to build a barn; and this being the case, he thought the Government should sell the lands—open a township here and there, and see how it would work. He was not in favour of the central prison system; the question was not the building of them, but the maintenance of them afterwards. He was a supporter of the Government, but would oppose them if they brought up the schemes for agricultural education and the prison system.

Mr. LYON thought if anything were omitted in the address, it should be noticed. He was very much pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for South Bruce on the destruction caused by fire in the Ottawa district. Although he (Mr. Lyon) was a member of the Government, he felt it his duty to speak out on this matter. He regretted that the Attorney-General was not in his place, in order that he might hear something concerning the manner in which he had acted with respect to the fire in the Ottawa district. Having narrated some of the incidents which transpired during the fire, the speaker proceeded to state that, in connection with the member for Russell, he thought it his duty to visit Toronto after the events he described. The Warden of the County and he (Mr. Lyon) called upon the Attorney-General, and regretted that the answer of that gentleman was that nothing could be done. He knew that Nova Scotia had received \$5,000, and hoped the Ottawa sufferers would receive some assistance. He asked for a loan of \$100,000 to those who could find good security, and also for a loan of \$50,000 to those who were owing the Government for their lands; and he also stated his belief that this House would back up any grant that might be given. The Attorney-General said it would be unconstitutional to give the relief. Finally, he offered to advance \$100,000 for ten years at 6 per cent if the County Council would guarantee it. He (Mr. Lyon) replied that the Council would guarantee it; but said at the same time that the banks had loaned money at 4 per cent. The Attorney-General answered that the money would be locked up for ten years, and that there could be no other terms than those he had proposed. The terms were referred to the people of the burned district, but they refused them; and said they would not accept the loan even at four per cent if that was the way they were to be treated by the Province. He felt very deeply the sympathy which had been so generously expressed by the leader of the Opposition. (Hear, hear.) He might say that the leader of the Opposition as well as the Attorney-General himself had forwarded each a donation to the Relief Committee. He might also say that all the sympathy he received from the Attorney-General was "What have you done that the Almighty has afflicted you in that way?" (Laughter.) The reply that he (Lyon) made was—"I am sorry to say the only reason I know is that I have supported your Government for three years." (Renewed laughter.) There was application made to the Local Government of Quebec; and the answer was that although there had been a fire in the Saguenay district, and \$15,000 had been contributed, still the Government would not let the deputation go away empty; and they contributed \$3,000. (Applause.)

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—Was not that for the Lower Canada side?

Mr. LYON replied that it was for all the sufferers. He might say indeed, that there were but one hundred families burned out on the Lower Canada side; while there were five hundred families in his (Mr. Lyon's) district, and sixty or seventy in the county of Russell. The Treasurer boasted

of the surplus of the finances; but Lower Canada, which had not any resources, had shown more generosity in coming to the rescue. After stating that the committee had received \$38,750 and had expended \$30,000, and complaining that the balance was totally inadequate to the demand, the speaker went on to comment on the action of the city of Toronto. The Relief Committee had been promised \$10,000 by Toronto, but he supposed the city thought as the Premier did, that the grant would be unconstitutional. He regretted that even no private contributions were started here, for several western cities had stated they would follow the lead of Toronto, but Toronto gave no sign. He thought the Province of Ontario could well afford to give \$50,000. The Treasurer had stated there were \$3,100,000 laid up. He (Mr. Lyon) would ask were the people to be turned out to starve rather than that a constitutional principle should be broken?

Mr. BLAKE—Hear, hear.

Mr. LYON said that if the Government, when they came down with the estimates, should make no provision for the Ottawa sufferers, and if the Opposition did not bring in a vote of censure, he would do so. The Government would be turned out on that vote; and they would be defeated if they went to the country on it. But if they were defeated they could not accuse him, for he had generously supported them, and would do so still; but he could not face his constituents on this question. He was sorry the Attorney-General—who, as he understood, was sick—was not now in his place to explain his action in this matter. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. BAXTER said since he had been in the House he had given an independent support to the Ministry. If such a disaster as that referred to by Mr. Lyon had occurred in the district he represented, he should have gone to the Premier as a matter of right; but if the Ministry opened their coffers and rendered assistance to the sufferers, they must do so on the principle of justice. Defining his position, he had voted on principles which he felt sure the country would sustain. Immigration demanded liberal dealing at the hands of the Government; and the exertions put forth in bringing the agricultural class of immigrants to this country should be extended. He thought the country required some amendments to the Grammar School system, and he hoped that the bill might escape the fearful treatment it received last year.

Dr. BOULTER was gratified at the speech but would not commit himself to any point until he saw the bills. It was satisfactory that they were now in a position to know what their actual state was. He believed that the establishment of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum was but an act of justice to that part of Province, and would support any amendment of the School Law which would benefit the country. Under this head he advocated the teaching of the rudiments of agriculture, &c. With regard to the Controverted Elections Bill, he would accept a bill from the Ministry rather than from the Opposition. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member, after reading some extracts from THE GLOBE of 1853, said he hoped that something would be done in the estimates for the Ottawa sufferers. Of course it was not necessary to put everything in the address that the Government intended to do.

Mr. TETT said he would have been better pleased with the speech if a reference had been made in it to the Ottawa devastation. He thought it would have been creditable to the Government to have suggested to His Excellency to mention the sympathy which he must have felt for the unfortunate sufferers. The devastation extended over a district of some eighty miles, and the sufferings of the people in his district were terrible, and were beyond the power of any language he could command. He was happy to see a disposition in hon. members on both sides to extend sympathy to the sufferers, and hoped to see at least a sum of \$50,000 placed in the estimates for their aid.

Mr. COCKBURN could not agree that the Free Grant Act was perfection. The provision that the settlers should pay the current price on their timber when they used it for building purposes, while they had liberty to burn it, was at least invidious. He was in favour of railway grants, and having supported the hon. member for South Bruce's Bill last session, he was glad to see that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill for the trial of Controverted Elections. He had been referred to by Mr. Blake at the demonstration at the Music Hall, and he wished to defend himself. He denied that he had ever asked or received a favour from the Government either for himself or his friends; that when he was elected

he was not a supporter of the Ministry nor to vote with the Opposition; and that the letter referred to in the speech was written in explanation of a confidential remark he had made to some hon. members in the House, and it then only referred to the estimates. Immediately after the conclusion of the estimates, he had voted against the Government on the Dower Bill introduced by the member for South Bruce. He might have committed errors of judgment and not of heart. Since the last session, he had not seen Mr. Blake, and had only called at the Attorney-General's office twice.

Mr. BLAKE said he had never stated, publicly or privately, that he had any reason to believe that he (Mr. Cockburn) was seeking to obtain any personal advantage; but he did charge him with having laid down a false principle of public morality in the letter to which he referred.

Mr. GRAHAME (York) said that he generally approved of the speech. He considered it unfair, however, that in some of the older settled portions of the country settlers should have to pay in full for their lands, while settlers in the new territories were getting their lands free. He thought the remarks of the hon. member for South Bruce with reference to the arbitration were somewhat unfortunate, and that the hon. Treasurer was entitled to credit for his exertions. In his opinion, a portion of the surplus could be advantageously employed in aiding railways, and in increased grants towards aiding immigration. (Hear.)

Mr. CARLING (Huron) was in favour of railway grants; and thought that some portion should be given to the districts inhabited by those pioneers who had borne the burden of the day. He was quite willing to leave the matter in the hands of the Government. He was an earnest advocate for the new Election Law. He had been himself a victim of the old law, having been kept out of his seat two years by its dilatory action, and consequently would support the Government in the introducing a new Bill for dealing with controverted elections. He thought his constituency would approve of his conduct.

Mr. MURRAY considered that the Ottawa district had been somewhat neglected, and he hoped it would receive attention. He trusted that the municipal loan funds would be distributed at an early period, since many municipalities were wanting the assistance of the fund. He thought that those members who opposed the Government stood in their own light. (Laughter.)

Mr. MATCHETT regretted the personal character of the debate. He had always supported the Government.

Mr. CROSBY regretted that there was no reference in the address to a timber policy. It was one of the most important questions they had to deal with. The licence being granted for one year only, there was not that attention paid to the preservation of timber that was desirable. He had seen more direct adherence to party on the other side of the House, although every Conservative member, on rising, expressed his anxiety to get rid of party. He had promised to give the Government a fair trial; but in the first session they brought down a free grant policy, which showed at once so close a policy on the part of the Government; that he was compelled to support the more liberal propositions of the Opposition. (Hear.)

Mr. CURRIE entered into some explanations with regard to the completion of confederation, contending that the Attorney-General was justified in forming his Cabinet in the manner he had. He also applauded the action of the Commissioners of Public Works and Crown Lands, in personally visiting various parts of the country. After referring to the free grant districts, he considered it unfortunate that the hon. members for Lambton and South Bruce had stated their conviction that it was advisable even to strain a point to keep up party. He was not altogether in favour of the grants to railways; he thought that a part of the surplus could be well applied to granting additional subsidies to common and grammar schools, and to the agricultural societies of the country. He also suggested to the Government that the statutes should be distributed free to the municipal officers; and that the *Journal of Education* should be discontinued. He was in favour of a more vigorous immigration policy.

Mr. REED supported the policy of the Government as a whole, and was in favour of opening up the back country by means of railways.

Mr. CRAIG (Glengarry) did not think it was right that the Government should expend all