

there were many gentlemen supporting a Government who were pledged to give a fair trial to any Government which happened to be in power, and they thought that if they could only get over here now they would be able to maintain their position; but they would be disappointed. The battle power so near their grasp would slip from them, and he had no doubt that the majority of the people of the country would be glad to find it so. If the principle were adopted that a Government was not to be entrusted with the disposal of the public money, how was the public services of the country to be carried on? How were school and other appropriations to be carried out? The resolution as it had been advanced by the hon. member for South Victoria (Woods) was, in the opinion of the Government, no better than the resolution of the member for Bruce (Blake), and therefore they would oppose it. (Cheers.)

Mr. ROBINSON said that the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands had repeated what he had before said, all of which he had replied to. The member for Lincoln had once attended a Reform caucus and told them all that he had previously heard at a Conservative caucus. He (Robinson) then proceeded, in the same violent manner, to reply to the attacks which had been made upon him. He said that he had heard the Minister of Justice saying at Kingston, in a private conversation, that he had just returned from Toronto where he had been selling the Ontario elections. (Cries of "shame" and "private.")

Mr. BOULTBEE rose to make a protest against the unseemly language which had been used in the course of the debate, and for which he held the hon. member for South Bruce chiefly responsible. He (Boultee) had never heard in a Legislative Assembly or any other place more offensive language than fell from the member for Kingston (Robinson). (Hear, hear.) He had never heard gentlemen allow their feelings to carry away their judgment. He would not sit in the House and let that hon. member, or any other, look across the floor of the House at him with a sneer on his face, which was echoed by every member on the Opposition side from the leader down, that he did not believe that there was an independent member on this side of the House (Cheers). The hon. member for Bothwell might think that he was an older politician and an older man than he (Boultee); but his sneer came badly home to him until he had shown that he was not independent. He called upon hon. members to put down this thing, to curb their tongues as much as possible, and he called particularly upon the hon. leader of the Opposition to restrain his following from using abuse which would not be proper in a bar-room. (Cheers.) Hon. members were there to deliberate on matters which were far too grave and important to be stirred over, to have dirt cast upon them, and to be dragged through mud and mire, (hear); and he trusted they would so deport themselves. The hon. member then went on to express his approval of the amendment of the hon. member for Victoria, which he intended to support. The people of North York were too clear-headed to approve of the unseemly and disgraceful policy of dividing the surplus up among themselves.

Mr. OLIVER spoke of the Secretary's unsuccessful appeal to Oxford, and claimed that the Government had lost the confidence of the House.

Mr. DEROCHE said he represented almost the largest constituency in the country, and had been returned on somewhat the same platform as the member for Kingston, and it seemed strange to find one on one side of the House and the other on the other. His (Deroche's) ideas of independence were not that a man should attach himself to a party and follow it through thick and thin, but to support all measures which he considered to be for the benefit of the country. The manner in which the member for Kingston had made his personal allusions was not dignified, statesmanlike, gentlemanly nor refined, and he (Deroche) felt that he had great reason to be thankful that he was an independent member of a stamp different from that hon. gentleman. He regretted that the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House seemed to approve of the style of personalities that had been indulged in. In reference to buttonholing new members, he said that he, a new member, had never been approached by either side. The fact must be that some of the newly arrived members must be of more importance than others or else were of weaker character. (Hear, hear.) If their moral determination was to support only that which was right, they would not be approached by either side. (Hear, hear.) He intended supporting the amendment of the member for Victoria (Wood).

Mr. SINCLAIR thought it unbecoming to hear lectures from the other side of the House, and passed a compliment on the conduct of Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. CUMBERLAND would refer to some observations made last night by the hon. member for Kingston, whom he would recommend to put a break upon the flow of his eloquence, and adverted to the conduct of certain members of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER rose to order. He thought personal observations should not be introduced.

Mr. CUMBERLAND regretted that he had called down a rebuke from Mr. Speaker to whose decision all would submit at length. With reference to the Scott murder, he believed Roman Catholics and Orangemen would be equally ready to come forward to maintain the law. He characterized the resolutions introduced by the hon. member for South Bruce, in the previous session, as being of a character which placed them beyond the province of that House. He had thought that that hon. gentleman would have brought to the aid of the House all the legal ability and powerful intellect which he possessed, but had been disappointed in that hope. He characterized the appeal to his supporters which the hon. gentleman had made as a theatrical clap-net. The Opposition had disregarded

the facts set forward in the speech of the hon. member for South Victoria, and had appealed to the cupidity of those whom they represented to be entitled to that money. Mr. Cumberland continued his review of the political career of the hon. member for South Bruce, but Mr. BLAKE rose to order.

The SPEAKER thought that it was not necessary to go into these matters. It now being six o'clock the House took the usual recess.

ATTER RECESS.

Mr. CUMBERLAND resumed, and quoted some of the Globe's former opinions about Mr. Barber.

Mr. MACKENZIE raised a point of order. Reading newspapers in the House was not according to Parliamentary rule. The SPEAKER said it was not according to rule but usage.

Mr. CUMBERLAND continued reading his extracts, which accused Mr. Barber of being shuffling and incompetent to the last degree, without independence, and designating him "a dead-house." He (C.) did not believe that hon. gentlemen would agree with the side of the House on which he was now sitting.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria) said that after the many remarks made upon the subject he did not expect to throw much further light upon the subject. Considering the recrimination that had been thrown across the House from one side to the other and the repetitions of private conversations that had been made, he would henceforth be careful to whom he spoke, especially the members on the Opposition side of the House. He was much pained to see that the respect due to old age and long political service had not been accorded to the Attorney-General in repeating conversations. (Hear, hear.) He (Wood) agreed with the first part of the motion of the member for Bruce, but not with the latter touching the fund under consideration. The hon. member had spoken as if his amendment had been brought forward at the instance of the Government, but the action of the Ministry clearly showed that such was not the case.

Mr. FOREST said that if the motion of the hon. member for Bruce was intended to censure the last Parliament, or as a motion of want of confidence, he would oppose it most decidedly and strenuously. Until the large number of vacant seats were filled it would not be fair to try the strength of the House, as was evidently the intention of the hon. member for Bruce. He had no fault to find with the measures foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne. The paragraph respecting education was worthy of all approval, as was also that which related to the drainage assistance. He believed that the fusion of the courts of law would be a great boon to the country. He would ask the hon. member for South Bruce to define the object of his amendment; did it merely point out a railway policy, or was it intended to convey a way policy, or was it intended to convey a censure of the past acts of the Government? If merely the former, he thought the hon. gentleman would receive a large amount of support.

Mr. BLAKE said his motion expressed its own object.

Mr. WOOD'S amendment was then put to the House. The Speaker gave his decision accordingly.

Mr. COYNE referred to the charges of undue influence being exercised in certain constituencies, and said that he was in a position to bring similar charges against the Opposition. He considered that the Ontario Legislature should be entirely independent of the Ottawa House. It had been held that this House occupied the same position towards the Province that the county councils did towards the respective counties, and the legislation of this House should have the welfare of the Province for its object. He thought that question brought before the House should be judged on their merits, and if the Opposition adopted any other principle they should let it be known. He was one of those who had voted in favor of the proposal made in the last session to appropriate a sum of money in aid of railways; that motion was not supported with the view of placing it in the power of the Government to exercise any corrupt influences.

Mr. Blake's amendment was then put to the House. On the Names being taken the Clerk announced the numbers to be, yeas 40, nays 33.

YEAS—Messrs. Barber, Baxter, Blake, Christie, Clarke, Wellington, Clark, (North) Clarke, Cook, Crooks, C. Oshy, Currie, Dawson, Fairbairn, Farwell, Finlayson, Galbraith, Gibbons, Gibson, Gow, Grant, Hodgins, McCall, (North) Mackenzie, McKellar, McKim, McManus, Oliver, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Perry, Prince, Robinson, Sexton, Sinclair, Smith, Springer, Webb, Williams, (Hamilton) Wilson—40.

NAYS—Messrs. Boulter, Boultee, Calvin, Cameron, Carding, Clarke, (Greenville) Goddard, Gurney, Coyne, Craig, (Glengarry) Craig, (Russell) Gurney, Deacon, Deroche, Ferguson, Fitzsimmons, Graham, Guest, (Leeds) MacCallum, McEneaney, (Cornwall) Macdonald, (Leeds) Macdonald, Merrick, Monteith, Reid, Richards, Rykert, Scott, (Grey) Tooley, Williams, (Durham) Wood, (Brant) Wood, (Victoria)—33.

Mr. Speaker therefore declared the amendment carried, and then put the original motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he wished to make some remarks on the motion. He was happy to say that there was now a united Liberal Parliament. He felt great regret in being compelled to take up a position in opposition to the Hon. Attorney-General. It was necessary for good Government that parties should exist, and hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House were not free from partisan feeling. The leader on the Ministerial side had, however, succeeded in breaking up the Conservative party as he had boasted of having broken up the Liberal party. It had been said that the House was not competent to condemn the legislation of last Session. But what was the object of the last election? The country had been appealed to on this very question of the railway aid fund, and the country had returned hon. gentlemen on his side as their answer. He referred to the observations of the hon. member for Algoma, with respect to responsible government, and maintained that on the principle brought forward by that hon. gentleman the House would be degraded from its legislative

functions. The hon. Commissioner for Crown Lands had asked him to produce precedents of details of estimates being required to be produced before Parliament, and he would refer him to the estimates brought down by Lord Palmerston in reference to the fortifications of Great Britain. He was surprised at the Orillia banquet to find that hon. gentlemen found it necessary to introduce politics, and he had promised to answer in his proper place the questions there introduced. He maintained that the Act of 1849 did not involve any principle of the kind now brought forward by the Government, and claimed that that act was more in accordance with the principle laid down in his hon. friend's amendment. He had pointed out many times that under the Government scheme it would be in their power to exercise influence over hon. members. With regard to the sites selected by the Government for public buildings, he censured the policy they had adopted, and the action of the Government with respect to the promises they had held out to the electors of particular districts. He accused the hon. leader of the Government of holding office by the support of the Ottawa Government, and on the condition of implicit obedience to their will; and of maintaining himself in power by supporting his supporters. If the real policy of the Government had been shown to the country, ministers would have been left scarcely half a dozen supporters. It was not so much on the railway aid question, but on the general policy of the Government that this issue had been raised in order to show that the country had entirely repudiated the Government policy. The Opposition had been accused of blackening the characters of the old Reformers by condemning the policy of the Government, but those Reformers would have never dreamed of adopting such a policy. They had been told that it was not morally to attack a portion of the Government policy, but his hon. friend's motion expressed a want of confidence in an important principle laid down by the Government. Mr. Mackenzie reviewed the circumstances under which ministers had resigned in consequence of votes of no confidence, and expressed the opinion that this matter of the appropriation of a million and a half dollars was a proper subject on which to challenge the Government. Would the hon. gentleman venture to disregard the straightforward decision of the House? He accused the Government of retaining power by obtaining large votes of money to enable them to exercise influence over the constituencies. Upon that policy they had taken action in the usual manner by moving an amendment which had been accepted by the House. He accused the Government of bringing pressure to bear upon an hon. member of that House for the purpose of compelling his resignation. But without that they had the vote of a full half the House in favor of his hon. friend's amendment. The Government might take what course they chose, but he would take care to place the matter fairly before the nation. They had been challenged to produce an instance of corruption on the part of the Government, but that he would not attempt to do; he was now attacking the general policy of the Government. He felt that the policy initiated by the hon. gentleman in governing this Province was dangerous to the existence of the Province. On the question of economy in the public expenditure he accused the hon. gentleman of voting entirely at the bidding of his leader in the Dominion Cabinet. He would admit, however, that on several occasions the hon. gentleman had given good votes, notwithstanding the opposition of his colleagues.

Hon. Mr. CARLING denied the accusation of having ever attempted to influence the vote of the hon. member for Brant.

Hon. Mr. WOOD corroborated the statement of his colleague.

The Hon. ATTORNEY-GENERAL denied that he had ever written a letter to the hon. member for Brant on the subject of his vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE said it would be recollected that one of the things they were bound to do by the Act of Confederation was to carry out the Intercolonial Railway scheme. However, the Government on the representation of Sir G. Cartier had chosen to adopt an expensive and circuitous route, although a more direct and better line was pointed out, being influenced by the threat of Sir Geo. Cartier to break up the Government if that scheme were not carried out. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had endeavored to get that question deferred in order to give time for the consideration of the question, but was opposed by the leader of the Government. On the question of the Pembroke Railway, too, he had been opposed by the Home Government. Believing that there should be an entire severance between the local and general Governments, he held that it was improper for any man to hold a seat in the two Houses, and he had only accepted a seat in that House in order to record his vote against the system of dual representation. How could that system be destroyed except by bringing into that House men determined to vote against it. He believed there was a great future before this Province, but reforms were yet needed. He was opposed to any system of taxation or any sale of timber which would tend to interfere with the taking up of land by immigrants. There was a vast tract of land lying desolate and unoccupied, and as long as the policy was maintained by endeavoring to raise a little money from them in the way of taxation they would have to put up with a limited immigration. With regard to the surplus, it had been maintained that it was a good thing to have a large surplus in the public treasury, but he was strongly opposed to that policy, and charged the Government with carrying the principle to excess. For these reasons which he had adduced he believed it was necessary to move a vote of want of confidence, and in order to express that he would move that the following words be added to his hon. friend's amendment—

"But we inform Your Excellency that we have no confidence in a Ministry which has attempted to carry out in reference to the control of the said fund of one million

five hundred thousand dollars, a usurpation fraught with danger to public liberty and constitutional government."

ATTY-GEN. MACDONALD in rising to speak, said that he regretted that his voice was not strong enough to make himself as distinctly heard as he would like. He would say at the outset that he did not object to the tone and manner in which the hon. gentleman had addressed the House, nor did he complain much of the manner in which his own name had been referred to by him. If the debates of the House were always carried on by everybody else in the same manner there would be less bickering and recrimination than had been shown on this occasion. Of course he did not admit that the range of subjects to which the hon. gentleman had referred had been a proper one, nor did he admit that the duties which devolved upon him and his colleagues as members of the Dominion Parliament were proper subjects of debate in this chamber. (Hear, hear.) He was responsible for what he did at Ottawa to the constituents he represented there, and he could say that they who had known him from his youth had never deserted him. (Cheers.) After four years of laborious efforts to carry on the Government of his native Province, with all his sins that had been charged against him by liberal members, and by the anathemas of gentlemen opposed to him and who were here present, he had been elected by acclamation, and he desired no better certificate of character against these inflammatory appeals of the hon. gentleman than that those who knew him best had sent him here. (Cheering.) He felt bound from the range which the hon. gentleman had taken in regard to the circumstances to which he referred to follow his example. The hon. gentleman had not only brought an indictment against him for acts which he was there to account for since he had formed the administration in 1867, but he had gone back to much older Parliamentary history. He (the Attorney-General) would not go back farther than '67, except to refer to one or two matters alluded to. It was not the first time that he had been accused of having formed the Government of Ontario on the understanding that he should have in the Government persons representing both of the great parties which existed at that time. He said that those who knew him best, and the hon. gentleman himself had known him for years, knew that he was not in the habit of obeying the behest of others, but rather that he must have his own way or else stand alone as he had often done on former occasions. (Hear, hear.) It went to the mind that both parties went into the question of Confederation for the purpose of settling all these sectional difficulties and disputes which had disturbed the country for a number of years. He had not been a party to that Coalition. He saw opposite him an hon. gentleman who had opposed the policy of that Government as strongly as he had done, and who had taken the same ground, namely, that the abandonment of the old constitution to form a new one without an appeal to the people was unjust and unconstitutional. However Confederation had been forced upon them. It had been charged against him that he had betrayed the Reform party which had given him a character. He denied that he was ever the leader of the Reform party. He had been the leader of a Government as he was now—the leader of a Government, not of a party. In 1862 he had been scarcely on speaking terms with most of the members of the Reform party. That was a coalition Government as well.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had never stated that the Atty-Gen. was the leader of the Reform party. The hon. gentleman asked us to form a Government in 1862; he called a meeting of the liberal party. What right had he to call that meeting? He had submitted his policy to the meeting and said if the liberal party would suffer him he would go on, if they did not suffer him he would not go on. They agreed to support him except on two questions, except representation by population and separate schools. He claimed that they had kept him (Atty-Gen.) in existence.

ATTY-GEN. MACDONALD said that he was glad he was speaking in the presence of those who knew something of the circumstances which had been referred to, and he denied that he called that meeting. (Cheers.) He had been asked to attend a meeting in order that he should hear what the Reform party had to submit to him.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that he had been told that the meeting would be called and had been invited to attend.

Mr. MCKELLAR said he had also been asked.

ATTY-GEN. MACDONALD said that before the meeting was called he had been told that the meeting would be assembled and he was asked to attend. He stated this

now advisedly, as he was in the presence of those who could testify to what he was saying. It was only a few hours after he was sent for that the meeting had been called, not because he was the leader of the Reform party, as he had always been carrying out his own views. The hon. gentleman said that he had been the leader of the Reform party. When had he been elected? When did they choose him as such? When the great leader of the Reform party, the man who controlled them now and gave them existence, the Hon. George Brown, was defeated in '61 in Toronto and was no longer in the House, what course was taken? He (Atty-Gen.) was not even asked to the meeting where the candidates were the Hon. Wm. McDougall and Mr. Foley. Why, he was not then on even speaking terms with the gentlemen.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had not called the hon. gentleman the leader of the Reform party, but had said that it had supported him and kept him in existence.

ATTY-GEN. MACDONALD said that was the thanks he got for giving to the Reform party the only life it had had since the time of Mr. Hincks in 1854. This was the sort of talk that was sounded from every bar-room and from every stump in the country.