

ment said, not being able to take that view of the subject that it could be surrendering the conscience of the Government—that they were not in a position to do so, but would deal with the surplus at another time. Did the hon. gentleman mean to tell them that at that time the Government proposed to deal with the surplus until the question was finally settled? If he did so understand it, he (Mr. Cameron) could only say that the hon. gentleman had misunderstood them. It had not been the intention of the Government to deal with that question until they knew what money they had to deal with, and they did not intend to subject the country to direct taxation. The Government believed that the income of the country, with proper use, was sufficient for its purposes; but if there was an increase in the expenditure, the chances might be that it would be necessary to resort to direct taxation. The Government were not going to encourage anything of the kind if it could possibly be avoided. Now that was the violation of pledges which the hon. gentleman had alluded to. There were hon. members there who had been present and who knew what the Government had said on that subject, and the Government would be prepared to redeem the pledges made, notwithstanding the view taken by the hon. gentleman. He presumed the hon. gentleman would like to test the strength of the House while so many seats were vacant, thinking perhaps he had an opportunity, in the absence of a number of the supporters of the Government whose elections had been set aside, but, according to the reports of the judges, by no fault on their part. The hon. gentleman knew that those gentlemen would be returned as supporters of the Government, and his attempt was to bring up now a motion which, in fact, had been negatived by the House on a previous occasion when he had the whole support of the House, but if so he would find that his object would not be attained. The hon. gentleman had compared the boroughs with the county constituencies, and had seemed to think that the intelligence of the latter was so much greater than that of the boroughs, but it was remarkable that a constituency of the intelligence of that represented by the hon. member should have thought it necessary to send to the city of Toronto to get a man to represent it, and should be indebted to it for having the hon. gentleman as a representative. Other constituencies had thought fit to apply to Toronto for representatives. He believed that during the last Parliament, or during the session of the last Legislative Assembly, Niagara, London and Toronto East were represented as now and no observations of the kind were made. The hon. gentleman appeared to think that a course of this kind was at once witty and indicative of very great statesmanship, but the Government apprehended that the people of the country would require more than that. He presumed that the constituency of Cornwall had just as much right to be represented here as any other constituency, and the representative of one constituency was entitled to as much consideration and respect on the floor of that House as another; and he thought the boroughs would not thank the hon. gentleman for the slur cast upon them. That gentleman had charged the Government with having put forward a very meagre bill of care. He (Mr. Cameron) admitted that the Government had done more during the previous four years than any administration since the union of the Upper and Lower Provinces had taken place, for the advancement of the material interests of Ontario; and what had been done during those four years had left very little to be done during the present session, especially since it was not known very well how they stood financially. Reference had been made to efforts which had been alleged to be made for the purpose of gaining supporters for the Government, but the hon. gentleman forgot the efforts of the Opposition. He believed that a question had been put by a candidate for Parliament a partner of the hon. member for South Bruce, and that hon. gentleman had answered that there was no impropriety in endeavoring to influence classes of the community, but that it would be very bad to attempt to influence an individual. It was quite proper to endeavor to induce that very large body, the Roman Catholics, by any reason or arguments that could be directed to their particular feelings or appeal to the feelings of the Orangemen would be perfectly right whether the representations made are honest or dishonest. Now he (Mr. Cameron) did not understand morality that way; he believed that no representations but those based upon truth should be made to the people, and that no statements should be made in the false and dishonest manner in which they were for the purpose of blackening character, and to make the country believe that it was governed by dishonest leaders. But no complaint was made from that (the Opposition) side of the House of anything of that kind. It was not found that the waited upon the proprietors of their representative journal and asked them to confine themselves within some bound of propriety. Circumstances had occurred, said the hon. gentleman, which rendered it necessary that a reduction of the price of land sold to actual settlers should be made but he gave no consideration to the time and labor required to ascertain how these reductions should be made and who were entitled to them; and that because that had not been accomplished it was held as a rod over the people of that section. The hon. gentleman had ventured on that statement without knowing anything about the facts (Hear, hear). From the head of the administration nothing more than justice could be expected, it was left for the Opposition to promise still more favorable terms. As yet nothing had fallen from his hon. friend to indicate any error in the policy of the Government, excepting in so far as it furnished in the resolution which had been brought forward with respect to the manner of dealing with that surplus of a million and a half. But that measure had surely been sufficiently considered. It was shown on the face of the Bill exactly what the power of the Government was, and that the money could not be appropriated to make railways just when the liked; all parties coming within the provisions of the law were entitled to share it. If there were two applicants for

railway extension in the same section of the country it was not possible that both should receive the aid, and it would be for the Government to decide which was entitled to it. Only one could get it, and that was what the law contemplated. The Government had very little power under the Act to deal with the money in any way, its discretion being completely limited. Suppose that half-a-dozen railways are seeking aid and that Government came to the House to obtain its consent, how much time would be occupied in the consideration of which railway should be entitled to it, and when a solution was arrived at would it be any better a decision than that which the Government might have come to? When the Government had done a wrong thing it would be time to complain of it. If the question was to be settled in Parliament there would be constituencies bringing their influence to bear upon the Government from different sections of the country; that is the way in which it would be done. Hon. gentlemen said that the Government has brought forward no policy, but it did not appear that the leaders of the Opposition had any policy to place before the House; therefore it was obvious that the Opposition was entirely of a factious nature. (Hear, here.) There was not a man in that House who did not feel that the Government would deal justly with the railway interests, because the individuals on that side of the House were just as honest and straight forward as hon. gentlemen on the other side. He said, if the Government measures were good, and that if the Government went astray, those who supported it would soon cease to do so, and the first act of injustice on the part of the Government would be met by its friends as well as its opponents. It is to be regretted that at the opening of the session we are to be met with the same share of factious opposition which has been brought against us in previous sessions, instead of there being a determination on their part to aid the Government in carrying on the affairs of the country until they can develop a better policy; and when they can do that and show that the welfare of the country is their object, the Government would be quite prepared to make way for them. It being 6 o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

At a quarter to eight the debate was resumed. Mr. CROOKS said that the provisions of the Railway Aid Act left very much in the hands of the executive, the mode of the disposition of the large sums of money appropriated for the purpose of aiding railway enterprise. He considered that the present Government should not be entrusted with so much responsibility. He did not wish to cast any doubt on the personal honesty of any member of the Government, or of any hon. gentleman returned to the House, but he intended to express by his vote on this question his disapproval of the system of placing so much power in the hands of the ministry. The country had seen deputation after deputation appearing before the Attorney-General, and almost begging him for a portion of the aid due the railways they represented. He himself had called upon the Attorney-General as a member of a deputation from the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, and his experience on that occasion led him to believe that it was entirely wrong that any portion of the country, or any hon. member representing any section, should be so placed at the mercy of the Government. If he as well as the hon. gentleman representing East Toronto had been a supporter of the Government, perhaps the deputation from the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway would have been better treated. No Government, whether one in which he had confidence or not, would ever receive his support in assuming to itself so much power. There was no precedent for such extended authority having been given to any Ministry. There was no hon. member, either in this House or in that in Ottawa, who so much deserved to have his motions respectfully treated as the hon. member for South Bruce, and he (Crooks) was certain that this opinion was shared by the majority of the people of Ontario. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had no right to speak so slightly of the hon. gentleman's motives in bringing up this amendment. He then went on to refer to the Scott murder, a topic which he said he had purposely avoided in his election campaign as a matter somewhat above ordinary political discussions. He regretted that the influence which the large Province of Ontario should wield at Ottawa was not felt on account of the solid phalanx of votes from Quebec. In respect to the interference of the Government of Ontario and Ottawa in the elections, he said that he himself could assert that every officer and employee of both Governments in West Toronto had been instructed to vote against him. He was of opinion that any Government ruling Ontario should be entirely independent of the Government at Ottawa. In respect to the elections he said that secret information in respect to their time had been imparted by the Government to those who were expected to support them. The gentleman who had on a former occasion seconded his nomination had been pledged to the support of his opponent who no doubt knew of the close approach of the election. He did not agree with the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands when he said that the Opposition should bring down a policy. That was not the duty of the Opposition whose province was rather to keep a watchful supervision over the acts of the Government. He objected to the policy of the Government in hoarding up the funds of the Province instead of using them for the advancement of the country. He objected to the reference made by the Commissioner of Crown Lands to the remarks of Mr. Bathurst during the election trial in which he himself was respondent. That matter had been fully discussed in the press and at a meeting was founded on which the objection was a distortion or misapprehension of the remarks of the Advocate referred to. He repudiated the idea that he or his party were in any way under the control of the *Globe*, and maintained that that journal kept its position because it expressed the views of

the great liberal party. He said that the Government of Ontario were responsible for the unfortunate consequences arising from the settlement of the arbitration question. If they had exercised the same diligence during the first few years of their power that they had done just before the elections, a great deal of the subsequent complication would have been avoided. The secret of the whole difficulty was that Ontario had a full treasury after the four years had passed—and Quebec's exchequer was depleted. If this Government had not procrastinated this difficulty would have been avoided. His opposition to the Government was based upon the belief that it had not in it the elements which a Government ought to possess. It had not initiated any valuable measures, but had merely carried out the hints of the Opposition. The Nova Scotia resolutions were a specimen of this. Judging the Government by its acts he believed he would never have any doubts as to his correctness in having voted for the motion of the hon. member for South Bruce. Mr. CUMBERLAND said he begged to tender a welcome to the Chamber to the hon. member for West Toronto in however questionable company he might find him, and to sympathize with him in the labor of the terrible labor he had just undergone in defining his position. At the outset he might have been expected, bespattered by his leader, the hon. member for South Bruce, and then he fell to the support of a particular journal towards which, and with which he has peculiar associations. It was only natural that the presumed leader of the Government that is to be, should receive the praise of those who follow him. Favors to come, especially as these favors are promised so soon, might well excite the praise of such young members as he for West Toronto. And so with regard to the journal to which reference had been made. Who could wonder that the hon. member for West Toronto should have a good word to say for it having reference to that fact, and the pecuniary support for which he is indebted to it. He (Crooks) boasted on his first appearance in the Legislature on the support which he had received during his election from all parties. He forgot to state what rumor states, that there was very good reason for this support from all parties; he forgot to explain how so thorough a radical as he determined a Grit as the hon. member should have, as he said he had, received support from all parties; but the fact of this universal support gave a colour and substance to the terrible accusations which were made as to the practices of that election. He (Cumberland) thought it strange that the hon. member for Bruce in moving his amendment should have directed his attention solely to one object, that of expenditure to aid railways. Why not lay down the broad principle of which his motion was the exponent; why not attack the old British system of executive responsibility; why not introduce the American system where the responsibility is broadcast; why not attack the whole system for which the party he represents had fought and some of them died—of which executive responsibility is the very foundation? Was our Government going to be degraded into a system which, giving each member executive responsibility, should send it broadcast over the whole House—and what did that mean? It meant such a distribution as would not make any individual feel his responsibility—a system under which the people could not find who was responsible. A system of giving and taking, a system which is now illustrated at Albany and New York. It was so convenient a thing for gentlemen who, like the member for South Bruce, so soon anticipated office, a convenient thing that he, and those associated with him, should shirk the responsibilities happily pertaining to the occupants of office now. But who was going to play from the other side the part of "Boss Tweed," who was going to walk into office without executive responsibility; who on the right hand of him, and there he (Cumberland) saw the smiling face of the hon. member for Bothwell who should play the part of Connolly, and who on his left should play the part of Hall? Then when this triumvirate had assumed office, he could imagine the convenience of the irresponsible system when they could cry out, Hurrah, boys, now is the time; grab what you can, and no robbery can be discovered, and it will not be written in history; take what you can, and while you may. (Applause and laughter.) But he (Mr. Cumberland) was not going to betray the principles which are peculiarly characteristic of the British constitution. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for South Bruce had devoted most of his time to the consideration of everything that was not in the speech; and first of all he referred to the changes which had taken place on this side of the House. He discovered reasons for glorying in the changes he saw. He forgot to mention how many new and smiling faces there were in the House, and how many old and kindly faces there were to lament. He spoke about the martyrs, men whom he rejoiced were not here, and therefore criticized somewhat severely. He (Cumberland) hoped that the member for Halton (Barber) would forgive and forget the fact that not long ago he was regarded as one of that dreadful number, and he (Cumberland) hoped he would swallow not only his principles, but the recollection of his blankets—a painful subject, and one in which he had the full sympathy of the House. (Great laughter.) But what of the boisterous Brother Boyd? (Laughter.) Not a voice of lamentation because his seat is vacant. That man who was especially the honour of the other side of the House—who sang so loudly and flopped his wings so fiercely. No tears for the political martyrdom of that gentleman? He sought for a reason why the hon. member for Prescott should go unwept and unhonored. If the leader of the Opposition received from the member from West Elgin, (Hodgins) that support which he expected, then, perhaps, the House might believe that in his new follower he had ungratefully forgotten the memory of the lost member for Prescott. He had seen beneficial changes in the Cabinet, but were there not changes elsewhere? How long was it since the hon. member

for Bothwell was unseated in his leadership to make a change, and may be the House would soon see that hon. member giving way to the member for Middlesex. The Opposition leadership had changed from moderation of language and amiability for intellectual arrogance—moderation of speech for the poison balm of conceit. They had changed the real people's democratic sympathy for arrogant bearing. The hon. member for Bothwell had a manner and a method that conciliated the support of his opponent; the member for Bruce had a manner and a method that could not fail to reject the support of anybody. These were the changes on the other side of the House. It had lost a leader who might have led them to victory for one who would ever keep them where they were. The question of the surplus had come under the criticism of the hon. member. He had condemned the rolling up of a surplus and he condemned the spending of it. What under Heaven were these poor Ministers to do? They were bound to be condemned no matter what they did, or how they did it. In what a nice state would the affairs of the House be if it had to decide upon the aid to be granted to each railway. How did the hon. member who proposed the amendment think that the House would decide upon such a case as was presented by the City of Bobcaygeon (laughter) through which there were to pass six railroads. Where Bobcaygeon was, his geographical knowledge failed to remind him. (Laughter.) No doubt Bobcaygeon was a most important place, perhaps some of the hon. gentlemen opposite would swallow Bobcaygeon whole and give a subsidy to each of the six lines, other hon. members would, no doubt, desire to subsidise only one line. What a field for debate was opened by the consideration of the question as to which one of the six lines should be aided and which five rejected. Was it not likely that each of these six railroads would have members of the House specially interested in them? How extravagant and reckless and wild a system of subsidy would a discussion in this Chamber lead to. An example of the evils of the proposed system have been afforded in the case of the selecting of the site for the Parliamentary buildings. Montreal, Toronto and Quebec fought for them, and nothing resulted except the destruction of successive administrations until the matter was placed in the hands of the executive and a compromise arrived at, and a disadvantageous compromise it was. If such a system were to be followed here, what would the hon. member for Hamilton say? Would not he fight with others for the establishment of public works in the city he represents. He was most happy to say that the hon. members on this side of the House were free to exercise their full rights, and felt the responsibility which was upon them of criticising alike the acts of the Administration and the Opposition. He was most happy to believe that on this side of the House, and among those members who had hitherto given their support to the existing administration, there were none who have signed a cast-iron pledge—none whose words were so trusted that they would not be believed—would not be accepted by their party until it was written in indelible ink and put into the breeches pocket of the leader of the party—(cheers)—put there in order to, what?—put there as a reminder to every man who signed such a pledge that his mind and his opinions do not belong to himself—that he has pledged himself to implicit obedience without the power of raising one dissentient word—that he has to go blind—that he has given up his his free independence—that he foregoes all his conscientious exercise of personal judgment—that he gives himself blindly to party and the leader of his party. (Cheers.) Mr. PRINCE after some jocular remarks on the way in which the debate had so far been monopolised by the lawyers said he had found that it was the rule of the House that no member should reflect upon any vote of the House except for the purpose of moving that it be rescinded; but it did not appear that that rule had been observed. So far he had heard a good deal of personalities about members of the House, but there were matters to which the country attached more importance than these. He was opposed to the railway policy of the Government because it went against the interests of his constituents, but he had no fault to find with the other measures of the Government. (Hear, hear.) Dr. CLARKE criticized Mr. Cumberland's speech in a tone of banter. He was glad to re-echo the allusions in the speech to the prosperity of the country which he attributed to the energy of the people and to Divine providence. There was a time when partiality allied to power impeded the progress of the country, a state of things which would even justify rebellion. What was now wanted was a paternal legislation. The municipal laws were imperfect and required revision. At present they were paralyzed by debt. But there was not a word of this in the speech. Nobody could object to the proposal for the extension of our common schools. Another matter which required legislation was not mentioned in the speech, and that was with relation to the power of assessors in the municipalities of the townships. These men had great power in their hands, and should be men of honesty and reliability, but legislation was needed to secure this. With regard to the finances, he alluded to the change which had taken place since the time of the Confederation Act. As a man of the people he would support the amendment of the hon. member for South Bruce, believing it to be inconsistent to beg as a favor that which they should demand as a right. The speech contained felicitation on the past, but little indeed was foreshadowed for the future. Hon. Mr. RICHARDS described the circumstances under which this fund had come into the hands of the Government. With regard to the award the remarks which had been made, assumed that the Government were the only parties who