

benches.) He had been a supporter of the Liberal party before the member of the Liberal party first put on breaks. He for South Bruce first put on breaks. He went on to say that the Government were not prepared to say, until there was a full house, that they had done anything wrong. Nevertheless, the Government would give consideration to the vote of tonight. He blamed the Opposition for taking advantage of the absence of one-tenth of the representatives of Ontario to bring forward this motion, and when the vacant seats were filled he would not oppose a motion to drive him from power. He said that since he had been in Parliament—which was since the 14th of June, 1841—he defied the Opposition to say he had ever given a Tory vote; he might, however, have given Conservative ones. He had never engaged in land jobbing or in contracts. When he held office, if he had consented to give \$15,000 for a Gatineau Bridge or \$5,000 for Poupart's Slides, he might have been stronger. But rather than adopt a practice which he had blamed in those whom he had opposed, he yielded up office altogether. (Cheers from Government benches.) He denied that when he formed the Government in 1867 that there was an engagement to bring in both parties. The first person to whom he spoke on the subject of joining the Government was that sterling old Liberal, Hon. John McMurrich. He thought that if he had that gentleman in the Ministry he would be a hostage for its liberal character. He went on to contend that the Conservative party was entitled to participation in the Government, for without its assistance Confederation could not have been brought about. He had consequently called in their aid, and thus secured their assistance towards carrying out successfully the great purpose of Confederation. He had determined to treat both parties with an equal hand, and the result was seen in the prosperous state of the Province. But for this he had been subjected to the greatest abuse and calumny that ever a public man had to submit to. He had to institute a new Government, and the honourable gentlemen opposite, instead of generously thanking him for, as he had been told by one of his friends the other day, having indicated, if he was not the architect of confederation, abused him to the utmost extent of their power. He claimed that the present Government had acted most liberally to the settler on the agricultural and mineral lands; that no Government had effected so great a law reform, and that if he had swept the goals of lunatics and placed them in Rockwood Asylum, where 300 of these unfortunates were now cared for, why did not the Coalition Government of 1864 look after this matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE said the lunatics were then in Rockwood Asylum. But what about the Government of 1862 and '63.

Hon. Attorney-General MACDONALD—There has been an increase of lunacy since then. (Laughter.) With regard to the locations of public institutions, he believed it to be nearly impossible to get the House to agree to a site for public institutions. The House had granted \$200,000 for drainage purposes—would the hon. gentleman say that this also was stolen? The best answer was that three-fourths of the money was expended in counties which returned members supporting the Opposition leaders. This showed the equitable manner in which the Government disbursed its funds.

Mr. MACKENZIE said there was no favour involved. It was too bad of the hon. gentleman to attempt to infer any such thing. The money could be obtained cheaper in other ways.

Attorney-General MACDONALD said if this was so it was remarkable that other counties were applying for aid from this fund. He contended that the location of public buildings at London and Brantford showed that such institutions were not placed by the Government in consequence of the support of the constituencies surrounding those towns. The Government had also introduced measures securing summary jurisdiction and the early trial of controverted elections.

Mr. McKELLAR said Mr. Blake had introduced the Bill during a previous session.

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD said it was the practice of the Opposition when it heard the Government intended to introduce a measure, immediately to place a notice of a similar measure on the Orders of the House. Then there was the School Act, which although not all that was desired, yet was very satisfactory in its workings, and reflected great credit on the venerable Chief of the Education Bureau, Dr. Ryerson. He had recently held a conversation with a Grit whose only objection to the present Government was, that there were "two Tories" among its members. The Government had managed its affairs economically, and no charge of a wrong use of the public monies could be made or proven. With regard to the Railway Fund, he would say that only two orders in council had been issued, taking not more than one-fiftieth of the fund, and these were not payable until the roads in question were completed. The Act passed last session was far safer and more in the public interest than that referred to by the hon. member for West Middlesex. The powers of the present Government were far less than under the *pro rata* regulations of the Act of 1849, passed by the late Mr. Baldwin, one of the fathers of reform.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the aid granted under that Act took the shape of loans.

Atty. General MACDONALD thought they had an excellent example of this in the loan to the Northern Railway. Mr. Macdonald then referred to the charge of profanity brought against him while receiving a deputation from Strathroy, which he flatly denied; and claimed that if the Queen thought it not improper to use the name of the Deity when addressing the House of Lords and the Bishops, surely it was not improper for him to invoke the assistance of the Deity to direct the good people of Hastings in their onward progress. But it seemed as if he were not to be permitted to do that which was quite proper for others to do. He went on to say that he had been charged with bribery and corruption in order to keep office. He challenged gentlemen opposite

to show a single instance in which any one due influence or promise was made for the purpose of securing votes in this House. He had been charged with having brought pressure to bear on a member of the present House to make him resign.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that what he said was that pressure was brought to bear by a Bank with which the Attorney General was connected.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD said he declared from his place in the House that he never was aware until now that the gentleman to whom reference was made, had owed the Bank of Montreal one cent. He had been attacked for his conduct and dual representation. Now, when Lower Canada sent her best men to the Dominion Parliament, he wished to know why Ontario would be prevented from doing the same. He denied that he was subservient to the Ottawa Government, but said it would be foolish in him to quarrel with that Government which supported him in keeping the path of rectitude. He referred to the motion of which Mr. Blake had given notice with reference to the representation of Manitoba and British Columbia, and said that he would give each of these Provinces ten more members if it would make their people happy. He concluded by apologizing to the House for the time he had occupied in addressing it, and said that the bill of indictment framed against the Government brought home to them no charge of mismanagement; and declared that the finances had been well conducted, and the new system of Government placed in good working order. The Government would continue to discharge their duties as heretofore, until the House properly constituted should give them a gentle hint to retire. (The Attorney-General resumed his seat amid applause from the Government benches.)

Hon. J. G. CURRIE moved the adjournment of the debate.

The House adjourned at 12:25.

Parliament of Ontario

SECOND PARLIAMENT--FIRST SESSION

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Mr. RYKERT presented the first report of the Committee on Standing Orders, asking the reduction of its quorum to nine members.

THE DEBATE ON WANT OF CONFIDENCE.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE rose and said that when he entered political life, in 1862, the Attorney-General was the head of a Reform Government. He (Mr. Currie) acknowledged him at that time as his leader; but he now found himself under the leadership of the gentleman on his right (Mr. Blake), the Attorney-General. It was quite clear that he (Mr. Currie) had changed leaders, though at the same time he felt quite sure that he had not changed his political principles. (Applause.) In 1862, he had given to the Attorney-General faithful and warm support, and he only regretted that on re-entering political life, and rising for the first time to address the House, he had fallen to his lot to oppose that gentleman. He (Mr. Currie) found, however, that he was supported by his political friends; but the Attorney-General could not say the same, for he had in his Cabinet as Commissioner of Public Works a gentleman who had formerly offered him the most bitter opposition. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. CARLING—What about the Coalition of 1864?

Hon. Mr. CURRIE said he should do that quite soon enough for the Commissioner of Public Works. (Hear, hear.) He must say with regard to the Address that he had expected to find it rather meagre. It was simply a tissue of common places with reference to past measures; and it brought down but one single proposition—to provide for the payment of witnesses in criminal cases. He could not really find fault with the Address so much for what it contained as for what it omitted. (Hear, hear.) There were surely many important questions on which the country desired legislation. There was, for instance, the disposition of that portion of the surplus at present undisposed of; there was a measure to settle the Municipal Loan Fund difficulty; there were also law reforms. The country at large expected measures dealing with these subjects; and it also expected an amendment of the present election law. (Hear, hear.) It would have been well also to have dealt with the question of dual representation. (Hear, hear.) He had hoped that the Atty. General would have brought down a measure to exclude members of the Dominion Parliament from seats in this House; but that expectation had been disappointed. (Hear, hear.) The country had also reason to expect some improvement in the land policy—(hear, hear)—for the settlers on the free grants expected a far more liberal policy than had been pursued toward them. (Applause.) Perhaps if the elections which the Atty. General had sprung on the country, had resulted differently we would have had a more extensive programme. But the result of these elections was of the greatest benefit to the country, for Mr. Blake went to the people with but sixteen or seventeen supporters, and had come back with a majority to control the House. (Cheers.) He (Mr. Currie) would simply state the reasons why he was in the Opposition. He opposed the Atty. General, because his Cabinet was composed of gentlemen who held entirely different political views, and who had united without a policy, unless it were the policy of taking office and holding it by any and every means in their power. (Cheers.) The elections in 1867 were carried by the Government, owing to the manner in which they were conducted. The cry of "no party" was raised, and by means of that cry the Attorney-General found a small majority to support him. But he needed additional support, and shortly afterwards gentlemen elected to oppose him were found supporting him. His course with regard to Hamilton

was a specimen of his policy. He went up to that city to support a Conservative, and then made his famous axe-grinding speech. They had heard of him attempting to bribe voters and members; but here was an attempt to bribe a whole constituency, which was most censurable. He told the electors of Hamilton in effect that if they elected Mr. Williams they could not get the deaf and dumb asylum. The people of Hamilton would not be frightened by him, and they returned Mr. Williams by a large majority. (Hear, hear.) The Attorney-General carried out his threat, and asked and received a vote from Parliament for the building of the asylum without informing the House where it was to be located. Such a course was directly contrary to all precedent. No previous Government had received grants of money without fixing the place where it was to be spent. The Government claimed great credit for economy. What were the facts? In the first year the expenditure was \$1,182,000; the following year it was \$1,444,000, being an increase of \$262,000; the next year it was increased to \$1,575,000, an increase of \$333,000; and the estimates for the present year were \$2,602,000, being an increase of \$1,420,000 over the expenditure in 1868. The surplus last December was \$3,095,000, for which the Government deserved no credit, except for hoarding it up, and yet with that surplus the Government had placed a tax upon his county of \$5,000, a county where the Government had not spent a single dollar.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD—What tax was that?

Hon. Mr. CURRIE—Is it possible, that the honourable gentlemen has placed a tax upon the country and does not know it?

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD—We did nothing of the kind.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE said he was surprised that the hon. gentleman did not know the tax they had imposed.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON—What tax is it?

Hon. Mr. CURRIE—Does the honourable gentleman mean to tell the House that they imposed no tax?

Hon. Mr. CAMERON—Certainly we did not.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE said that he would tell the hon. gentlemen what the tax was; it was the license tax. That was a tax unknown before confederation. A good deal had been said in the course of the debate about his election, particularly by the member for Lincoln. That gentleman told the House that he (Mr. Currie) came from a Conservative county. It did claim to be a Conservative county; he went before the electors of that county as a Reformer, and opposed to the present Administration on the ground that it was a Coalition Government. He took the ground that the best Government was a Reform Government, but that if they could not get a Reform Government then get a Conservative Government, rather than a Coalition. He was opposed by all the strength of both Governments and by the Grand Trunk, and he was elected to help to displace this Coalition Government. A good deal had been said about the Government being a Borough administration. The hon. Secretary had in 1867 attempted to get a constituency in the east but failed, and was obliged to seek refuge in the little borough of Niagara, the gentleman elected for that place residing into the office of a coroner. But there was a little story told in connection with that resignation. Shortly after Parliament met it was called on to vote \$11,000 professedly for the purpose of facilitating the transportation of passengers and freight between Collingwood and Port William but it would have been nearer the truth had it been stated that it was for the purpose of helping the then Commissioner of Crown Lands to get a seat in the Legislature. But when the hon. gentleman got the Borough he did not seem to like it, for they found him last spring going up to South Oxford where he was beaten by nearly double as many votes as he got in Niagara altogether. That hon. gentleman told the House the other day that his constituents were very respectable people; but not content with that he had to bring up the venerable bones of the illustrious dead lying under Brock's monument. He (Mr. C.) did not wonder very much at the hon. gentleman bringing up the dead for he represented in the House very few of the living. (Laughter.) During the debate he had been amused at gentlemen opposite lecturing gentlemen on this side of the House upon parliamentary etiquette and propriety. One would suppose that gentlemen opposite had the appearance of a Beau Brummel, and the manners of a Chesterfield. Gentleman on his side of the House had been compared to the Tammany thievers, but if comparisons were not odious he might point to the worthy gentleman opposite who would be a good parallel to Col. Fisk of New York the railway magnate of that city. (Laughter.) The Attorney-General had stated that when he formed his Government in 1867 he was free to choose his colleagues. If that were the case it was surprising that he had not selected men who had before that been acting with him. That gentleman professed to be an admirer of Baldwin, but he (Mr. C.) was sure that great and good Reformers would never have been guilty of the conduct of the Attorney-General. The member for Lincoln had presumed to lecture the Conservatives in this House upon the course they chose to take. That lecture came with a bad grace from that gentleman, considering the course he had taken towards the Conservative party. In 1860 that gentleman entered public life. Before his constituents he did not declare himself either a Conservative or a Reformer, but he was elected as a Conservative; but when he went to Parliament he left his Conservative leader and became a follower of the present Atty. General. That was in 1860; but in 1863, when he came back to his constituents the Conservatives following the example of the party in Parliament would have nothing to do with him, and he was left at the close of the first day's polling a minority of 800 or 900. The result of the elections showed that the country was hostile to the Government. (Hear, hear.) There were in the House 82 members, 30 of whom were Reformers; and 32 Conservatives. Such being the case why did we not have party Government; why not a Reform Government? (Applause.) The Attorney-General had spoken of the want of experience by Mr. Blake as compared with his, (the Attorney-General.) But

Mr. Blake had abilities which all recognized, and he (Mr. Currie) hoped that he would soon have an opportunity of exercising them in leading the Government of the country, as he now did the Opposition. (Applause.)

Mr. BLAKE said that the Opposition had taken the earliest constitutional opportunity of conveying the sentiment of the country in respect to the surplus to the ear of the Lieut.-Governor. (Hear, hear.) It had been asked that matters affecting the position of the Government should not be discussed in a House from which eight members were absent. Well, he would just say this, that when the House was full the Opposition would be stronger than they were at present. (Cheers.) He would give examples from the history of the country, which would show that the argument as to vacant seats was altogether untenable. In 1851 the Government of the day resigned although they had a majority in the House. That House was composed of 84 members; nineteen were absent. In 1854 the House was composed of 150 members; the division was 107: 22 were absent; the majority against the Government was 16. That Government resigned. In the division of 1855, in a House of 130 members, fifteen were absent; the majority against the Ministry was 14; they resigned. In 1862 the House had 130 members; 14 were absent; the majority against the Government was seven; they resigned. In 1834 the House had 130 members. Eleven were absent; the majority against the Government was two; they resigned. In this Assembly there were 82 members; eight seats were vacant; 73 members had voted, the majority against the Government was seven, and they had been defeated in three divisions. It appeared to him that the Government had been most decisively and badly beaten. They had been defeated on a vital point of a public policy, on which they had staked their political reputation, and on which they had gone to the country. It appeared to him that without abdicating all responsibility as ministers of the Crown, it was impossible for the Government to remain passive under these votes. The principle of Parliamentary government was—that if the Government failed to get the support of the House they were bound to hand over the responsibility of conducting public affairs. This course was demanded by public morality and by the public interests. He appealed to the members of the Government individually and collectively not longer to resist the expressed will of the House; not to oblige the House actually to apply manual force—(cheers and laughter)—or to call in the policeman. (Laughter.) He called on the members of the Government by what every public man ought to hold sacred—he called on them not merely by the traditions, but by the principles on which alone a Government could be successfully conducted—by the interests of political morality—by regard for their own honour and reputation—to speak now and at once, and declare that they would leave the places which the House told them they should not occupy. (Loud applause.)

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD said that the Government would exercise their responsibilities at the proper time. It was not the intention of the Government to take any step in reference to the divisions that had gone against them; and especially since eight seats were vacant. He defended the policy of the Railway Act of last session and said that during the recess his Government had only given the minimum amount under orders in Council, to the two railways that had made application. He held that it would be utterly out of place for the Government to take action in respect to the votes that had been given, unless the vacant seats were represented; and until then it would be utterly out of place for the Government to exercise any political function except its ordinary functions of administration. The Government would not do anything further with the million and a half until it was decided who should occupy the Treasury Benches. The Government were not to be driven from the position they had taken. When the gentlemen opposite had succeeded with Mr. Mackenzie's motion, it would be for the Government to come down and tell them what course it would take. In the meantime he desired that the House would proceed to answer the Address. Until the House had taken action on the Address, nothing more was to be said by him in answer to the gentlemen opposite.

Hon. Mr. WOOD took the ground that unless a Government was defeated on a measure essential to the proper administration of the Government, they were not called upon by constitutional practice to resign. That was the practice in England. The Government were, to a great extent, to be the judges of that. But, as he understood the votes that had been given in this House, they covered a wider field than merely the Railway Act, and showed him that the House was not satisfied with the present composition of the Government. (Hear, hear.) It might be said that this House did not represent properly the sentiment of the whole country. There might be something in that. It might be that it would give more satisfaction if the eight seats which were vacant were represented in this House. There was certainly a distinction between a person having an opportunity to be present and absenting himself, and a person who could by no possibility be present. However, in view of the votes which had been given by a majority of the House against the Government, in view of the fact that he had been unable to bring from the Reform side of the House any support to the Government, in view of his examination of constitutional practice and usage, he thought it his duty, in view of the position of the House as already expressed, to resign his seat. (Loud Opposition cheers.) In saying this he was bound to add that the Premier did not coincide with the conclusion to which he had arrived. The Premier thought it constitutional and proper that he (Mr. Wood) should defer the matter till the vacant seats were filled. However, taking into consideration that it was not alone on the railway policy that the warfare against the Government had been waged, and that persons who supported him in the late Parliament had now intimated to him that they were not in a position to give the Government any support whatever, but on the contrary must uniformly vote against it, he thought it his duty to resign at once. (Hear, hear.) In doing this he must tell the House that his relations with the members of the Government, from the begin-