

could compel the carrying out of that award, but that was not the case. Suppose that the award was illegal, in what position would the House find itself if it attempted to deal with that question, and found they had no power to do so. In view of that, and that the Imperial Government could place the matter before the Privy Council, it was impossible that the House could deal with the question of the municipal debt. It was not in a position to do so until the question was decided whether the award was to be carried out or not. It was certainly expected last Session that it would be dealt with, but circumstances had changed. Then it had been charged that the placing of this large sum at the disposal of the Government was an improper and corrupt act and contrary to the principles of constitutional Government, but he asserted that the principle in which the Government proceeded was substantially the principle on which they had acted in 1849. The Government of that day comprised the best men of the Reform party, and he would not stand by and see their memories blighted. The hon gentleman opposite professed to hold in high repute the memory of that Government, and it ill became him to censure the Government which had introduced a similar legislation. The object of the Government was to open out the country by aiding the construction of lines towards the North, and in the cases of lines running through poorer sections of the country it was felt that aid was necessary, and he could not understand how it could be claimed that the County of Essex was cheated. Then a very large revenue had been derived from these very lands, arising from the timber dues, and in that shape they had received almost the entire sum which was now put down to that item. Considering that those roads were to be a public benefit by admitting the emigrant into the country, he said that the measure was justified, it was only an act of justice to the people. Before that million and a half would be expended he would venture to say there would be two millions of revenue arising to the public treasury from that particular locality. It had been part of the Government scheme of last year to reserve a portion of that fund to indemnify the municipalities which had borrowed money, and they had thought it unwise to devote the whole of that sum to other purposes. The hon. gentleman opposite had sneered at the borough which he (Mr. Richards) represented, but he thought that the representative of that constituency was as much entitled to respect as others. The hon. gentlemen explained the circumstances under which he had changed his position from the department of which he had formerly had charge, and in which he had acted chiefly from personal considerations. While he had occupied that position he had introduced a new system of collecting the timber revenue which had increased to upwards of \$420,000, and had effected a reduction of \$14,000 in the expenditure of the department. A large number of disputed cases had been settled during his tenure of office, and he believed the department had never been better managed than during that period.

Mr. CURRIE made some general remarks on the character of the Speech, in which he complained of the absence of any promise of legislation worthy the Government. He did not believe that an agricultural college was needed, and thought the money might be better applied to the assistance of railway enterprises. He would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for South Bruce.

An hon. member moved the adjournment of the House, but it was not seconded.

Dr. BAXTER referred to the allusion in the address as to the projection of an Agricultural College. He thought that the high schools of the Province were sufficient for the dissemination of agricultural education. He proceeded to attack the free grant policy of the Government when

Hon. Mr. CAMERON enquired if the hon. gentleman could adduce any instances where settlers were affected by any order in Council affecting the timber on those grants?

Dr. BAXTER could not, but he could say that he did not intend to vote for the adoption of the address. (Laughter).

Mr. READ had supported the Ministry for four years and intended to support them still. (Hear, hear). He felt that their policy had been a sound one, and if it was held wrong, those large majorities which had supported them during former Sessions must be condemned also. If the hon. members on the other side of the House should be able to secure the Treasury benches; if such a misfortune should befall the Province, he felt sure that the persistent cries about corruption, &c., would then be realized in all variety. He referred to the wisdom displayed in the selection of the site for the Blind Asylum at Belleville, and concluded by saying that he felt himself bound to support the adoption of the address.

Mr. SEXTON, after an eulogy of his constituents for electing him, admitted that the Government had sanctioned the passage of many good and many excellent measures, but contended that the Opposition had moulded them. He did not particularize the instances, but concluded with the general assertion that he had no confidence in the Government.

Mr. DEACON wished to define his position as a new member. In 1869 he had outspokenly declared his intention to support the Government. He read from his election address of that time to verify this statement, and to his views on immigration policy. In 1871 he had again addressed his constituents in a similar strain and he was elected to support the Government. The electors of North Renfrew were a unit on the railway policy of the Government; they considered it a sound one, one conceived for the best interests of the Province. He regarded the amendment as a reflection on the last paragraph of the address, and therefore, a reflection upon the last Parliament. Some of the members of the Opposition condemned the Ministry for accumulating a surplus, while others said that the Ministry deser-

ved no credit for saving the surplus, inasmuch as it rolled in of itself. Well, if it was not the Ministry's doings, this surplus, surely they could not properly be condemned for the possession of it. But this was only one of the many inconsistencies developed in the arguments of honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House. He would support the motion for the adoption of the address, because he felt that the Government was a good one, and because his constituency almost to a man endorsed the general policy of that Government.

On motion of Mr. COYNE, the House adjourned at 11:15 o'clock.