

disposed to believe that circumstances required that some explanation should be given before the House came to the conclusion that it was necessary to have more Normal Schools. As to criminal witnesses: he admitted that there was a smack of injustice in men being called upon to attend criminal trials at a sacrifice of time. But it had been urged that the citizens owed something to the state. A large increase of expenditure would be incurred; and it was a question whether the proposed measure was not interfering with the procedure in criminal cases, which, it was well known, was beyond the powers of this Legislature. As to allowances to private persons for tile draining; it would be time to consider this matter when it was ascertained how the loans could be collected from individuals. But was there not something omitted from the address? Where was the surplus policy? There was a promise last session that it would be dealt with the present one. The excuse was that the Dominion Cabinet declined to give effect to the award until a decision had been arrived at by the Privy Council. We knew all that before. Were Ministers really determined to inflict such a blow on our real material prosperity as would be given if they refused to deal with the surplus until the Privy Council had taken action? The Dominion Government could not say that the award was valid or invalid; this was their own state ment. The Government of Ontario had received full knowledge of this fact, and of the protests of the Province of Quebec; yet they had taken no pains to deal with the surplus in the meantime; they wished to put the matter off indefinitely until the award was decided upon by the Privy Council. Mr. Blake here proceeded to give the dates on which the Quebec and Dominion authorities had taken action on the award, and proved therefrom that the Ontario Government was fully informed as to the state of the question. He then said that the Government had gone to the country in March last, but they did not tell the electors that the surplus was not to be dealt with this session. Mr. Blake then read from a friendly report of a speech made by the Treasurer in June last, in which that gentleman had stated that at the next session of Parliament the Municipal Loan Fund would be dealt with.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Is there any allusion to the surplus?

Mr. BLAKE asked if the Treasurer intended to deal with the Loan Fund, must he not necessarily touch the surplus? (Applause.) Mr. Blake then asked if we were going to roll up the surplus year after year, and save off the most important measures, because the award was left undecided? The surplus was our own; it was the savings of the heavily-taxed municipalities, and so it was admitted to be by the Treasurer of Quebec, in a speech he made the other day. (Applause.) Was it to be said that the people of Ontario had not sufficient confidence in their own ability to meet their engagements, in order that this money might roll up to be an engine of political power in the hands of the Government? (Cheers.) To keep this money rolling up might be an inducement to arbitrators—if there ever was another arbitration—to put more on Ontario than was just. A more foolish, a more short-sighted, a more suicidal policy than that contemplated by the Government with regard to the surplus—rolling up the money for two or three years more, until it amounted to seven or eight millions—was never heard of before. (Applause.) The Treasurer of Ontario had told us that the province had enough in its special funds to pay the award; and, then, why roll up the surplus? The gentlemen opposite had not amongst them statesmanship enough to deal with that question. (Hear, hear.) Nor had they the political manliness to deal with it. (Applause.) They were too weak in numbers and in ability to make the attempt; and could not bring forward a scheme that would be acceptable to the House at large, and so they wished us to postpone the real material question of interest to the country. He could not believe that the House and the country would acquiesce in that postponement. He believed that their constituents expected that this session they would devise a proper mode of dealing with this surplus. The Government desired a postponement, because they wished to keep the money in their coffers. Now, the Opposition had always insisted that the Government were here to do the pronounced will of the House; and that it was a part of the discretionary functions of the House to control the public funds; that it was the duty of the representatives of the people to pronounce definitely before the public funds should be applied. The true rule was that an Executive which had the confidence of the House was entitled to a limited degree of control as regarded the funds; but Parliament betrayed its functions when it handed over to the Executive any power it could retain to itself, without prejudice to the people's interests. Otherwise the country would have the poor satisfaction of turning out a Ministry after doing wrong, instead of the wrong being prevented at its commencement, otherwise a Ministry, by means of a subsequent parliament, might retain power after the people had pronounced against them. The House and country knew the policy of gentlemen opposite. Their policy had been announced on many a platform; the exhorting, proclivities of the leader were well known. In the words of the poet,

And woe to the party who should ever
He says that he will give the county police."

(Applause and laughter.) There was in this House a sufficient spirit of independence to put an end to this state of things. There was a spirit of indignation abroad, and it was strong enough to say that this system of using the public funds should cease once and forever, because it was fatal to the best interests of the country. (Lead cheers.) Mr. Blake concluded by moving the following amendment, which was seconded by Mr. Fardee:—

"That we feel bound to take the earliest opportunity of informing your Excellency that we regret the course taken by the Legislative Assembly last session under the guidance of your present Ministers in reference to the large powers given to the Executive as to the disposition of the Railway Aid Fund, and to state that in our opinion the proposal of the Government to grant aid to any railway should be submitted for the approval or rejection of

the Legislative Assembly, so as not to leave so large a sum as \$1,500,000 to the disposal of the Executive without a vote of this House, appropriating the same to particular works." (Mr. Blake resumed his seat amid loud cheering.)

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that he always expected faction from the gentleman who had just sat down. Among matters with which this Government had nothing to do, to which the hon. gentleman had referred, was one which he (Mr. Cameron) had thought his sense of propriety would have told him should never be alluded to again in this House. He referred to the murder of Scott. The hon. gentleman should have seen, from the effect that his inflammatory harangue in the House just previous to the close of the last session had through out the country, that the thing should have been omitted on this occasion. Mr. Cameron characterized Mr. Blake's resolutions relating to the Scott murder, which he introduced into the House last session, as clap-trap, and said that the Government denounced outrage in question as much as any one else. The hon. gentleman had chosen also to allude to the representation of the Province of Manitoba in the Dominion Legislature. Has this House anything to do with that Legislature? and did the hon. member for South Bruce resist and vote in the Dominion Legislature against the granting of so full a representation in that body to the Province of Manitoba?

Mr. BLAKE—I did.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that they always found his honourable friend's voice raised more loudly in this House in speaking of matters with which this House had nothing to do, than in the Dominion Legislature where he met the representatives of the Province of Quebec face to face. Referring to Mr. Blake's appeal to the member for Essex to confirm his statement with regard to interference on the part of the Government in the elections, Mr. Cameron said that that too was a subject with which this House had nothing to do. Speaking of the early period at which the Government brought on the elections he said that it was a well-known fact that those who supported the Government were less likely to go out to the polls when the roads were bad than those who were stirred up by the energetic canvassers that the honourable gentleman sent out. (Laughter.) He (Mr. Cameron) regretted that the elections had been brought on so soon. He was satisfied that, if the people had had time to consider soberly the resolutions of his hon. friend in the matter of the Scott murder, things would have been different from what they are now for it was where a certain class were strongest that the Opposition had been most successful. His hon. friend had not chosen to attack anything in the speech from the Throne; he had said that certain persons must bear some inconvenience in serving the country, but he was not prepared at this juncture to take a stand against the payment of criminal witnesses.

Mr. BLAKE.—The hon. gentleman knows that an indigent witness may be paid his expenses.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that indigent witnesses in criminal cases might be paid by order of the judge only, but did any witness wish to go and claim payment for his time on the plea that he was an indigent circumstances? (Hear.) Alluding to Mr. Blake's charge that the Government had violated their pledges in exercising the whole control of the expenditure of the country, Mr. Cameron said that the hon. gentleman knew that under the constitution every transaction relative to the expenditure of the country has to originate with the Government, and that it was not in the power of the House to dispose of it unless it was so recommended. It must not be forgotten that they were indebted to the action of the member for South Bruce to a great extent for the opposition to the settlement of the arbitration matter that had been met with in the Province of Quebec. He repeated that the Government had violated no pledges that they had made. When they asked the representatives of the people on the floor of this House to allow the appropriation of a million and a-half of money for railway purposes, and the hon. member for South Bruce proposed that the whole surplus in the Treasurer's hands should be disposed of by handing it over at once *holus bolus* to the municipalities of the country, the Government objected to the adoption of the hon. gentleman's suggestion because they were not then in a position to deal with the surplus. At that time the Government did not know what would be the result of the arbitration between the Provinces, and did not intend to become responsible for bringing direct taxation upon the country. The Government would redeem their pledges notwithstanding what the member for South Bruce had said, and they would have an opportunity of doing so too. He (Mr. Cameron) should think that the hon. member for South Bruce, when he considered the number of seats at present vacant in the House, would feel disposed to test the strength of the House; but if he did he would find that he would not succeed in his object, and that the Government would still maintain their position. In reference to a remark by Mr. Blake Mr. Cameron said that members representing constituencies of 10,000 voters were entitled to as many privileges in this House as those representing larger ones. He did not see that his hon. friend had indicated any policy on the part of the Opposition. He had said that the Government had presented a very meagre bill of fare. They admitted that; but he (Mr. Cameron) claimed that the present Government had done more for the country in the past four years than any Administration had done during the existence of the union between the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and more than they could have been reasonably expected to do, when it was considered that they did not know where they were with regard to taxation. Referring to the charge against the Government using undue influence to secure the election of those who would support them in the House Mr. Cameron said that a gentleman who was now endeavouring to obtain a seat in the House—a gentleman who was in partnership with the member for South Bruce, from whom he probably imbibed some of his political views,—had declared that the feelings of a powerful party, such as the Orangemen, might be inflamed for the purpose of securing the votes, but that no inducement

should be offered to an individual. The gentleman had said that it was quite proper to influence Roman Catholics or Orangemen, by all sorts of reasoning that might be directed to their feelings, whether those who thus endeavoured to secure their votes were expressing their honest sentiments or not. He (Mr. Cameron), did not understand political morality in that way. He did not believe that any representations that were not perfectly honest should be made for the purpose of obtaining support for a party.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON went on to say that the chief organ of the Opposition was continuously endeavouring to injure the present Government by unjustifiable attacks upon it, and yet the Opposition did not take any steps to express their objection to such a course. In reference to Mr. Blake's remarks on the Crown Lands question, he said, that that gentleman knew nothing of the motives that had actuated the Government in that matter. They had not, in deciding on what land a reduction would be made, given any preference to one part of the country over another. The Opposition candidate for South Grey was leading voters to expect more favourable terms, if they put him into this House, than they might hope for from the present Government, because from the present Government they might expect only justice and not bribery. (Laughter.) Referring again to the disbursement of the surplus funds in aid of railways, Mr. Cameron asserted that if it were left to the House to decide what railways should be aided, the members from the section of country through which a certain railway was to run would secure the help of other members in getting that railway subsidized, in consideration of their assistance in returning obtaining a portion of the surplus fund for a railway in which these latter gentlemen might be interested. He did not believe that there was a gentleman on the other side of the House who did not feel that the Government would deal honestly with the railways. There were men on the Ministerial side of the House just as honest and intelligent as those on the other side, though they did not assent as much. (Laughter.) He regretted that just at the opening of this Parliament they were met with a similar sort of factionalism to that which they had met during the last session, and that they were being attacked on points that were of little moment, without anything being introduced that would be better for the country than what the Government had proposed.

It being now within a few minutes of six o'clock the House rose until half-past seven.

After recess,

Mr. CROOKS resumed the debate proposed, as he understood the amendment of a member for South Bruce did not profess to shadow forth how the surplus should be disposed of, but it simply affirmed a constitutional principle which lay at the base of constitutional government. It asked the House to affirm that the Executive of the day were simply as the servants of the people, to discharge executive functions, and that when a previous Legislature had entrusted to the Government matters over which they should have kept control, a constitutional principle was infringed, and by this infringement a great blow was struck thus early at our constitution. The amendment of the member for South Bruce affirmed the sound constitutional principle that this House and the House only should dispose of the public funds. The former measure alluded to in the amendment was calculated to destroy that control, and it gave a very large sum of money to be disposed of by the Government at their discretion. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had argued that this measure did not invest the Government with that power; but that the Executive were confined to certain limits defined by the House. But although this measure limited the disposition of the money to a certain class of objects, namely, railways, yet the amount and the conditions upon which it was to be granted were left entirely to the Executive. All that was defined in the Act was simply that it should be granted to a certain class of railways, and only to these under contract after a certain date. But as to what railways should receive aid, and the amount they were to receive—these important considerations were left to the Executive. (Hear, hear.) He thought it extremely dangerous that any Government—whether the present one or not—should have such power, and this House was doing violence to its constitutional rights when it gave it to them. The question was not whether aid should be granted to railways, but whether the sound principle of legislative control over the public funds should be maintained. Nor was it a question of the personal honesty of the five members of the Government. They had already seen some of the effects of placing this power in the hands of the Executive. They had seen deputation after deputation waiting upon the Government, and almost supplicating them to aid their enterprise, when, if the House had properly exercised its control these railway Companies would have come before the House and demanded their quota as a right. He was one of a deputation that waited upon the Attorney-General in the interests of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, and it came to the conclusion that Parliament in placing this power in the hands of the Government had placed railway companies and members of constituencies, which were interested in railways, in a position of great embarrassment. He felt on that occasion that had the member for West Toronto been as the member for the East, a supporter of the Government, the deputation would have received more encouragement than it did. The questions as to the amount they should receive; as to whether they should receive \$2,000 a mile from Orangeville, or Arthur or some other point—on these questions the deputation felt that they were entirely at the mercy of the Government. His view was, that the Government was wrong in two respects. First it was wrong on the eve of a general election in assuming to dispose of this large sum of money in this particular way; and, secondly, it was wrong to take the power of using it in such a way as to exert a most direct influence upon the electors. He was in favour of giving aid to railways, but at the same time he was prepared to defend the rights of this House and oppose allowing any Govern-

ment to exercise anything but executive functions. The legislature of the old Province of Canada did not dare to go as far in granting aid to railways. The Railway Aid Act of 1869 gave a certain amount of aid to railways as a matter of right. Under that act no discretion whatever was given to the Government of the day, and every railway was entitled, upon the performance of certain duties, to a certain amount of aid. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had assumed to impugn the motives of the member for South Bruce in proposing his amendments. If there was one member entitled to the utmost possible respect and to have his motions respected it was the member for South Bruce. (Cheers.) As one of the community he had watched the course of that gentleman from the time he entered public life, and he believed that no man in public life in this country was entitled to higher respect, (hear, hear), and that opinion was shared by the majority of the people of this country. (Hear, hear.) He was convinced that no man had done more to uphold constitutional principles in this country than had that gentleman. (Cheers.) He had hopes of the future of this country when he saw such men in the Legislative halls. He regretted that any one should for a moment have questioned the integrity of that gentleman or of the honesty of any views he chose to offer to this House. Then the Commissioner of Crown Lands had alluded to a question which he had better have left alone. There was no one belonging to any creed or party who did not regret the untoward circumstances in Manitoba, which resulted in the murder of Scott. He had, as far as possible, passed over that topic, which he felt was one beyond the arena of ordinary political discussion. He had hoped that after the resolution which the Government had caused to be passed last session they would be prepared to come down this session and tell the country, through the House, that what they had looked forward to a year ago had come to pass, and that the majesty of the law had been vindicated. With regard to the argument of the Commissioner of Crown Lands, that the Local Government had nothing to do with the interference of the Dominion Government in the local elections, that gentleman had not denied that there had been such interference. He himself had felt it; officers of both the Dominion and Local Governments had opposed him, and if the statement of the member for South Bruce was impugned, he was prepared to substantiate it. The Commissioner had argued as if the interference of the Dominion Government was merely accidental, and not through preconcerted plans. For his part, no matter what Government was in power, he was in favour of keeping the Local Government perfectly independent of the General. The functions of both were clearly defined, and there was no need of their clashing. With regard to the speed with which the elections were hurried on, he could testify that secret information had been given to certain Government candidates that the writs were soon to be issued, before the country was aware of it. With reference to the payment of witnesses in criminal cases, he did not see that that matter was of such importance as to take so prominent a place in the speech, and that fact the only one in the speech upon which the House was called to take action. He expected better things in the speech. He had expected some well considered scheme for the disposition of the surplus. At present the Government were receiving from the people more than they expended; and it was the duty of the Government to devise some means whereby this money should be returned to the people, either in public improvements or some other way. He went on to argue that it was not the duty of an Opposition to define a policy; it was their duty to watch and regulate the measures of a Government. He asked why did not the Government bring forward a practical scheme for the disposal of this surplus, and he said that he for one would give such a scheme a fair consideration. Direct taxation had been threatened if this surplus were touched; but there would never be any necessity for direct taxation if the finances of the country were managed on ordinary business principles. The Commissioner of Crown Lands should not have introduced in the way he did, a religious question that had been dragged into the report of a recent election trial in which he (Mr. Crooks) was respondent. The remarks attributed to the counsel in the case in question were either based on misapprehension or else a distortion. The advocate never used such remarks, and he (Mr. Crooks) entirely disclaimed that during the election for West Toronto there was any attempt made to influence class against class. (Applause.) The election was carried on with perfect equanimity. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had made reference to a certain leading journal—(THE GLOBE)—a journal whose influence was felt all over the Dominion, and read with the utmost respect abroad wherever English journals were taken. The charge was made that the votes and actions of gentlemen on this side of the House were influenced by that journal. That journal was opposed to any violation of constitutional principles and to the men who held power, simply because they knew how to dispose of patronage; so were gentlemen on this side. Mr. Crooks went on to say that he would be found working with the Commissioner of Crown Lands for the welfare of Toronto, without, however, claiming for the city any undue advantage. He criticised with great sharpness and regard to the arbitration between the two Provinces, and charged that it was their delay and doing nothing policy that had led to the present dead lock in the matter of arbitration. The Government had now been four years in office, and had never initiated a measure of public importance; but had taken their cue from the course adopted by the Opposition. He pointed to the Nova Scotia resolutions as an instance of the manner in which the Government welcomed the course pursued by the Opposition. He had watched the course of the Government for four years, and had found that they had failed in every respect. He would therefore vote against them, and would support the amendment. (Cheers.)

Mr. CUMBERLAND argued that the amendment, if carried, would have the effect of destroying executive responsibility, and asked who was the Boss Tweed on the other