

Government in the name of the Opposition—he charged them in the name of what was true and honest in political life—he charged them in the name of the people of Ontario with doing more to corrupt the public sentiment, and to sap the foundations of the right exercise of constitutional liberty, in the expression of public opinion, than any other previous administration, let it be Tory or Conservative. (Applause.) He was pleased with many expressions in the address, but he would like to know what was meant by the words "injurious dissensions." (Hear, hear.) If they meant that we were not to have discussion or opposition, he would like to know the fact. That there had been any injurious dissensions he denied; and he felt it was dishonouring to this body that his Excellency should have put into his mouth words of this character. Were there dissensions on the Mineral Bill? There was opposition, indeed, and it proved to be right, for the Commissioner of Crown Lands was glad, next session, to have the chance of killing his own child. Was it dissension for the Opposition to make suggestions with regard to the free grants, which the Commissioner of Crown Lands accepted? Was it dissension when the Opposition objected to a measure which the Attorney-General of England afterwards pronounced to be illegal? (Hear, hear.) Was it dissension last session, in the case of the bill to increase the salaries of the judges, a measure which was afterwards disallowed? If ever an attempt were made to interfere with free thought, and with the functions of a constitutional opposition, if there was ever a more deadly blow aimed at the expression of opinion, than the honour of it belonged to the first administration of the first Local Government of Ontario. (Hear, hear.) But the attempt would fail, as it deserved to fail. (Applause.) He (Mr. Boyd) would not oppose a measure simply because it owed its paternity to the Government, but he would criticise all their actions, as he had done heretofore, in spite of the words that had been put into the mouth of the Lieutenant-Governor. There would be a time next summer when the actions of every member of the House would be brought to the bar of public opinion, and when the people of the country would be the jury, and all that he would ask of the gentlemen opposite was not to bribe the jury. (Loud applause.)

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that the meaning of the words "injurious dissensions" was that we should not have any unnecessary and unseemly party strife, when it was the duty of every right thinking man to advance the interests of the country. He (Mr. Cameron) had been charged with having opposed Confederation, and it was argued that because the Attorney-General and the Commissioner of Crown Lands did the same thing, therefore they were not the proper men to be entrusted with the Government of the country. He opposed Confederation, because he thought—and he hoped that hon. gentlemen would give him credit for honesty—that it was not the best kind of union for the interests of the country. He also said it was not possible to have the separate governments at the same expense as they could have one. He saw that it was necessary that the people should be united in heart and soul with an honest determination of doing that which was just and right, fearless of consequences, and sinking party as unjust, holding the interests of the country as prior to these of mere party. If that was an improper way to look at the matter, he admitted that he had committed an error. As he however opposed Confederation honestly; when it became a fixed fact, instead of factiously opposing it, he at once gave in his adhesion to the scheme. It was his duty to do his best to carry out the scheme, and he thought that the praise which had been accorded to the Government already was a sufficient evidence that he and his colleagues had endeavoured to do what was best for the interests of the country. (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. Crow), 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 opportunity 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 promulgated. But notwithstanding that the proposal of Quebec was unreasonable, and notwithstanding the knowledge of the consequences of a decision, the Government of Ontario insisted on a decision, and thus gave what little excuse there might be given for the action taken by the Government of Quebec. The hon. Treasurer had shook his head when he called attention to his vote and that of his colleagues, as though they had not voted in the manner stated. He had referred to the hon. gentleman, if he doubted

the assertion, to the records of the House, and he noticed that the hon. gentleman in his speech did not refer to the matter. It was true that he had, at a later period of the session, when Col. Gray had received the appointment, but on his (Mr. Blake's) amendment he had voted nay. He, however, did not wish to attack the hon. Treasurer alone—he attacked his two colleagues also. He could not consider their votes as being those of three members without influence. Some persons said they had none—but they entertained a different opinion themselves. Passing from this matter, the hon. Treasurer stated that he would not be able to bring down his estimates early, stating that it was of no use to bring down a larger part of them, because they were merely nominal expenses, and that it was too early to decide with regard to those estimates which did not come under the previous class. The hon. Treasurer said that he was not yet ready to say what amount he should want for any of the schemes which had been foreshadowed by the Government. This conduct on the part of the hon. gentleman reflected in the greatest degree on the incapacity, if not the want of honesty of the Government—on their incapacity in not at once introducing the scheme which they were prepared to submit to the House, as just and capable and suited to the requirements of the country, and on which they were prepared to stand or fall, or on their want of honesty if they have no device ready yet, nor can tell us what they intend to propose until a late period of the session because their desire is to keep it in the dark, and until the work to be done in the corridors can be accomplished. (Hear, hear.) After referring to the change in the opinions of the hon. member for Peterboro' (Mr. Carnegie), to which allusion had already been made, Mr. Blake said that it had always been noticed that when the financial policy of the Government was disclosed, there were grumblings and growlings nearly approaching to revulsion on the part of many of its supporters, and it was to avoid this that the House and country were deprived of the estimates until a late period of the session. (Hear.) In reply to the denial that the policy of the Government with regard to the Medical Schools grant had been framed by the Opposition, Mr. Blake referred to the vote on Mr. Perry's motion settling the question, which was carried by 33 to 34, all the members of the Government being included in the minority; and to the subsequent vote endeavouring to replace the original motion, which was defeated by 49 nays against 23 yeas, among the latter again being found the names of four ministers. If the continued references to corruption by the Opposition leaders and press were demoralizing the people, they were infernally legitimately drawn from the public speeches of the members of the Government. (Hear, hear.) It was an insult to the public to say that they would credit the inferences if the ground was not capable of supporting them. But these charges of corruption had been referred to at an early period of that debate, and yet had there been any denial attempted of them? Four out of the five members of the Government had spoken, and but one of the four had referred to them in any way, and the hon. Treasurer had only said that if the Premier had done the things charged against him, it was very wrong, but he was sure of one thing—that they had been done with money from the public funds. This was all he could say, and it reminded him of the hon. gentleman's remark with reference to Col. Gray, namely, "that the less said about him the better." (Cheers.) Many of the supporters of the Government also had spoken, but they had not denied the charges in any way. Indeed, he had heard some of them say, when reference was made to the matter, "Quite right." But he defied any member of the House to stand up on the floor of the House and allow his name to go forth to the public, to be stamped with the indelible disgrace that would follow, if he dared to do so—he defied any man to do so, except the man who had said it before, and might now be bold enough to get up and affirm it—he defied any man with a reputation to take care of, to stand up in that House and affirm that they were sound principles. (Cheers.) Mr. Blake then referred to the position of the hon. member for West York on the Controverted Elections Bill, and to the remarkable way in which the member for South Ontario (Dr. McGill) had fulfilled his pledges. He agreed that it was a wise and judicious step, on the part of the Reform party, to recognize the labours of the men whose names graced the banquet hall. He (Mr. Blake) was the last man who ought not to make this recognition, for it was his good fortune to know some of them in private life, and to respect them as well for their private virtues as for their public acts. He rejoiced that they were able to recognize the beneficial acts of these men, and to know that their bodies are buried in peace, and their names live for evermore." (Loud cheers.)

After some personal explanation by Mr. Lauder, Mr. Smith (of Leeds), and Mr. McKellar, the House adjourned at half-past one a.m. till Monday.