

(Cheers.) A few hours after he had the honor of being called upon he was waited upon by a deputation of Conservatives, who offered him a majority of forty-five—offered it to him as a moderate Reformer whom they could follow. What did he say to them? He was now speaking in the presence of those who had heard him, and he repeated that he had said to these Conservatives that he would first see how his erring Reformers would act. The consequence was that the Reform party gave him their support on the condition that they were not to be called upon to oppose representation by population, he on his side abandoning his opposition to the Separate School scheme, and this he had only done at the earnest solicitation of Rev. Dr. Ryerson, who was then as now, a friend to Ontario and the cause of education. The Reformers then bring representation by population up so high that they couldn't reach it for two years. He challenged the hon. gentleman opposite to say that he had not been faithful and true to the promise he had made, that so long as they maintained their adhesion to him he would be true to them. He remembered that three weeks before he had been called upon to form a Ministry, they had voted that they would not join any party that would not make Rep. by Pop. a plank in its platform. Three weeks afterwards they had joined him, and he was well known to be opposed to that doctrine. Some trouble arose in reference to getting a member from Quebec, but finally it was agreed by that party that they should give him a support, except in the matter of Rep. by Pop., which they were to maintain whenever it came up. They were not to vote a want of confidence in the Government in respect to this question. He denied that his hon. friend had made out a case against him for betraying the party that brought him into political existence, but maintained that he could show a better record than any other politician in the country. He was the oldest continuous member of Parliament under Majesty's possessions in North America. (Cheers.) On the 14th of June, 1841, his vote was given against Mr. Allan McNabb as speaker, and he challenged the hon. gentleman opposite to show any Tory vote he had given since. He might, perhaps, have given votes with a Conservative tendency, but a really Tory vote he had never given. (Cheers.) The hon. member for Bruce sometimes was loud in his talk about Reform, but he could tell the House that he (Atty.-Gen.) was working hard for the old Reform party before the hon. gentleman was in breaks. Hon. gentlemen, such as he for West Toronto, who were new to political life, now called themselves staunch Reformers. It made no difference what he was, Tory or Radical, provided he came out in the interest of the *Globe* he was christened a good Reformer. He had always chosen to take his own course, and when he felt that he was not influenced by the same principle as had actuated him in early life, and when he felt that he was no longer able to advocate progressive measures he would retire from public life, regretting that old age had prevented him from doing that good which he had lived to do for the last thirty years. In reference to the allusion made by the hon. member for Middlesex to the state of things in 1871, he said that the hon. gentleman had referred to the vote then taken on the Speech from the Throne. That vote was not discourteous to the Throne, but was in the shape of a paragraph tacked on to the last paragraph of the Address, when the party who supported Lord Metcalfe was sworn out of existence. The action was on a Bill past last year in the belief that they were doing their best for the interests of the country, and the Government were not prepared until the country was fully represented in the House to admit that anything they had done was not in accordance with the wishes of the people. (Loud applause.) The vote of tonight would receive the consideration of the Government, but the hon. gentlemen opposite was not justified in the course they had adopted of taking advantage of the absence from the House of one-tenth of the representatives of the people to make his followers endeavor to pass a vote of condemnation. (Cheers.) He regretted to find that such a course had been adopted by gentlemen who recollected the never-to-be-forgotten cry which had been raised in 1858 on the action which had been so much deplored, and which was looked upon as a most outrageous attempt to trample upon the rights of the people. (Cheers.) At that time there were five or six of the Government who went to their constituents for re-election, and he was happy to say they had all been returned, and advantage was taken of their absence. The same gentlemen who then expressed their deep disgust were now attempting to get a verdict from this House in the absence of eight unrepresented constituencies (Hear, hear). Was that fair play? Were they so anxious to get over to the Treasury benches that they could not wait for a few days till a full expression of the voice of the House could be obtained. If the hon. gentleman could show that the voice of the House was against the present Government, he would find that as of old he (Attorney-General) would not oppose the motion that deprived him of power. (Cheers.) The hon. gentleman had chosen last night and to-night to facetiously say that when formerly leader of a government he had "g'n out" that he had collapsed. The hon. gentleman ought to be the last to allude to that. (Cheers.) He knew full well that he had continued for two years with a majority of one or two, endeavoring to sustain that part which had never given him power, indulging it with all the patronage of office and power, for it was well known that he (Attorney-General) had obtained nothing for himself. He had no relatives nor friends of his to pamper, he had never been engaged in any law jobs, in any fat contracts, in any interest—nothing of the kind. (Cheers.) It all became the hon. member for Middlesex to refer to the death of that Ministry, because it was by the defalcations which took place in the ranks of the Reform party, the party that ought to have

supported him, that that Ministry had ceased to last.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had never known of any defalcation.

ATTY-GEN. MACDONALD asked, did not the hon. member know that at the time it was proposed that Robert Bell should come into the Ministry that he (Atty-Gen.) had at the risk of his life proceeded to Quebec through snow storms, and only reached there the afternoon before the House opened, that the *Globe* had taken the opportunity of fulminating against the Government and himself, and described Mr. Bell as one addicted to a certain incapacitating vice. That broke down the Government. He probably could have continued to have carried it on for a while longer if he had chosen to give \$15,000 for the Gattineau slides, had remitted the tolls on the Grenville canal, but rather than adopt a practice which had characterized those whom he had deposed, he had resigned. He left the council table and begged some of his colleagues to take his place, and had stated that he was quite prepared to take his seat as a private member and support whatever leader would carry on the Government. (Cheers.) He did not claim that in doing so he had done more than was the duty of any patriotic, right thinking man. Did that look like clinging to office, of which the hon. member accused him so readily. He was sorry to hear such remarks from an hon. friend with whom he had had such close relationship in those times. When in 1867 he was called upon to form a Ministry, the hon. gentleman said that he had done so according to a previous pledge. He had stated in London at the first meeting he had addressed in Ontario after his appointment that no such terms had been proposed. He of course could not say what had been in the mind of the hon. gentleman who had recommended to the Governor General that he should be sent for. The first person to whom he made overtures as to a seat in the Cabinet was an hon. gentleman who lately held a seat in the House, the Hon. John McHurrich, because he thought that his presence in the Ministry would be a pledge that the act of the Government would be in contravention to sound Reform principles. When he came into office he found Confederation established, and he considered it his duty to do his utmost towards carrying it out successfully. When the Speaker called "carried" to the last clause of the Confederation Act he was the first to rise in his place and declare that although he had been opposed to the scheme he was prepared to support the working of the plan now that it was an accomplished fact. He knew to whom he was indebted for being sent for to form an Ontario Ministry, and he felt proud of being selected by Sir John Macdonald, to whom he had been all his life opposed, as he considered it a compliment paid him by a political opponent. He found that two great parties had contributed to bring about Confederation, and he asked was it fair when all the landmarks and restrictions and party difficulties had been wiped away, that he who had been elected not as a leader of a party should leave one of these parties out of the representation. (Cheers.) He had been called upon by the *Globe* as a Reformer to run the ship of state with men of his choosing, but as he was to be Captain he had preferred having a crew of his own selection. He then spoke of the Reform party having left him in 1871 when Mr. Brown went into coalition with the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MACKENZIE read from a report stating that Attorney-General had moved that Mr. Brown should join that Ministry.

ATTY-GEN. MACDONALD said that the whole meeting had been a farce played before them. Mr. Brown stated at the meeting that he had agreed that three Reform members should go in. He pretended that he himself did not want to enter, but that was a mere farce. He (Attorney-General) wished him to enter because the sooner he went in the sooner the farce would come to an end.

Mr. MACKENZIE here read a report of the meeting of the caucus.

ATTY-GEN. MACDONALD repudiated report which he said was a cooked one. He knew that ship would soon be wrecked, but he was proud of the crew-men of whom he had every reason to be proud, with whom he had at last succeeded in landing the cargo safe in the treasury. In what condition had they found the Province; Confederation had been brought about under the able leadership of Sir J. A. Macdonald, and the reward of that act was to be found in the present happy and prosperous condition of Ontario. He (the Atty-Gen.) had never regretted, and never would regret the course he had adopted on that occasion. He started with an equal regard for the interests of both parties, but had exposed himself to abuse such as no public man had ever received. In what condition had they found the question? The Reformers had been asked to abandon the principle of representation by population a principle which was a good one, and which would yet be had in time. Why should he not have been trusted then as much as any Reformer in the country? It was because he would not be the servile tool of those who attempted to dictate to him. He had found a new constitution, and his colleagues had had no experience of their duties. They had organized a House of Assembly, from the Speaker down to the messengers. They had to institute a new Government, to put the machinery in motion, and if hon. gentlemen opposite had a spark of generosity they would feel grateful to day that this duty was entrusted to one, who with his colleagues, had successfully carried out that duty. He was satisfied that the country would yet sustain the policy they had pursued. With respect to the free grant system, the Reformers had certainly proposed a few roads to open up the country, but the present Government had thrown open several townships, and hon. gentlemen must recollect the large amount which had been laid out on colonization roads. Yet they were told that they had not encouraged immigration. Let them look at the legislation with respect to the mines: in which the

Government policy had been most successful. The necessary accommodation for lunatics had been provided, especially at Kingston.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that the lunatics were already there.

The ATTY-GENERAL continued—There were some in the jail there but the Government provided accommodation for 300. The hon. gentleman would bear in mind that there had been great difficulties in the way. He had found fault with the Government for its selection of sites for public buildings, but it was impossible to obtain the unanimous or practically unanimous vote of that House in favor of any particular site in such cases. The object of responsible government was to carry out the purposes of legislation; but he accuses the Government of acting in a high handed manner and using undue influence. The Government devoted two hundred thousand dollars for drainage purposes; did the hon. gentleman say they stole that? He wished to refute the charges which had been brought against the Government. They had allowed all municipalities to come and ask for money, yet now they were charged with trying to obtain political influence, though these very counties had sent up men to oppose the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE said these counties had borrowed money; there was no favor at all; the money was lent them, but they had to repay it.

The ATTY-GEN. continued—The hon. gentleman said it was no favor, but those counties had expressed themselves very much obliged for it. The money was lent them at five per cent, and they were bound to return it within a certain time. It was all very well for the counties to say now that it did not benefit them, but they were very glad to get it. The Government placed a lunatic asylum at London in the most popular district of Ontario, and provided for 500 lunatics, and had they even gained anything by that step or by the erection of the building at Brantford? The Government was still prepared to build such institutions, if need be, without expecting any support for it. The hon. gentleman had complained of the lands taxed at Algoma. A staff of officers had to be maintained there, and did he mean to say that the nine speculators and others were not to pay their share of taxation.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that he had no objection to that; he had spoken on behalf of the settlers.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL continued—He had introduced the system of Interim Sessions, which had had the effect of relieving the municipalities of a large number of prisoners. Then in the election laws, reforms had been introduced, and other measures which had been put by the late Government had been dealt with by this Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that a Bill had been passed in 1864, which was defeated in the Upper House, but was again introduced in 1865. Mr. Brown then moved that it be postponed to the next session, but pledged himself that it should be brought forward, and it was passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that Bill was not taken up, but was postponed, and he recollected the rage of the party on that occasion.

Mr. MCKELLAR remarked that that Bill then introduced had been taken up by the Government.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that he had introduced that law. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought to allow the responsibility of the legislation to rest upon ministers; but instead of doing so they took hold of the measures which ought to devolve upon the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON remarked that it was a grab game. (Laughter.)

The ATTY-GEN. continued—The Schools Act of last Session introduced under the auspices of that Nestor of Education, Dr. Ryerson (cheers) had been most useful to the country and had been well spoken of everywhere. Such measures commended themselves to the good sense of the country. In conversation lately with an eminent Reformer he had challenged him to find fault with the parliamentary management of the Government, and he replied that the Government had deprived the Reform party of all credit for their measures. He (the Atty-Gen.) retorted that his Government had done a great deal more in the way of reform than hon. gentlemen on the other side. The Government offices had been well managed, but they were now accused of having violated principles in a manner dangerous to the interests of the country. Could the hon. gentleman point out a single instance of extravagance or of one dollar being misspent in any department? The Government had given contracts to the cheapest party; there had been no favoritism. Referring to the legislation of last Session he said that the House had given proof of its confidence in the Government by supporting it with large majorities, which they would never have done if they had thought there was any possibility of the Government squandering the money. He defied the hon. gentleman to show that any Government had ever been so careful with regard to money as this Government had with regard to this million and a half. They had had experience of such things in old times, in the case of the Grand Trunk and other roads; and the bill brought in in 1860 Government of that day than this Act gave to the present Government, for that Act authorized money to be handed to any railway not less than 75 miles in length to the extent of one half its cost, in any part of Ontario. He should like to follow the footsteps of that illustrious man at whose feet he learnt the first principles of constitutional reform. Were they to be told to day that it was dangerous to the interests of the country to do that which the father of Constitutional Government in this country had not thought unconstitutional? The Government of that day had the power to issue bonds without any limitation to railways exceeding 75 miles.

Mr. MACKENZIE remarked that it was only a loan.

The ATTY-GEN. said they had had some experience of loans like that to the Great Western; and the Northern Railway owed three millions. Those who understood Constitutional Government as well as the hon. gentleman had set the example; the expectation of receiving a share of that million and a half had caused railway enterprise to be developed, thus opening up the country. He was not going to say that the decision of that House should not be carried out; by a small majority it had decided that the will of the House was that grants of money should be submitted to the House. The consequence would be that the promoters of railway lines would not be able to feel any certainty as to what grant they would succeed in obtaining. What would be done in the meantime? Why it would have the effect of paralysing the energies of railway promoters. Was that the way to promote railway enterprise, by destroying all feeling of certainty; yet that was the effect of the resolution. The fault would not lie with this Government, but with those who claimed that Government had asked too much power in this matter. The Government had passed two orders in council for giving aid to railways; and although pressed very hard to give a larger sum, true to their determination to make as economical a use of the money as possible, they kept the sum down to the minimum amount of \$2,000. Then the hon. gentleman had attributed profanity to him, stating that he had expressed himself in an improper manner. He (the Attorney-General) had never used the word attributed to him. He had hoped that the conductor of the journal in which that charge had been made against him would have given a refutation of the statement, but they had failed to do so. He had never used that word. (Cheers.) Nothing could be more outrageous than to bring such charges. On one occasion, at Kingston, he had invoked the name of the Deity in an appeal to the people to abandon party strife, and devote themselves to the best interests of the country. The same thing was done by Her Majesty the Queen, in the closing paragraph of her address to the assembled representatives of the people. If it was right to employ such an expression before the House of Commons, it was right to employ it before the people of Hastings. The hon. gentleman had brought against him a charge of bribing people, and had said that he was given to acts of bribery, and that he had kept himself in power by bribing communities. He (the Attorney-General) challenged any person in that House to show a single instance of undue influence exercised by him by bribery or otherwise. With regard to the resignation of the hon. member for West Northumberland, he denied the statements made by the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE explained that he had said the words for the formal resignation had been telegraphed down.

The ATTY-GENERAL continued: If he were to follow the example of hon. members opposite, he could refer to conversations and correspondence on the subject, but he would not do so. With regard to Mr. Fraser he never knew that a letter was going to be sent. He did not know that he owed the Bank of Montreal one cent, and he did not at that moment. A letter had been written to him that Mr. Fraser was going to retire, but he had not deemed it necessary to endeavor to induce that gentleman to remain in the House. Why should he interfere? The hon. member for Middlesex had only presented a suppositious case, for which there was no foundation. He (the Attorney-General) denied in the most emphatic manner that he had anything to do with forcing Mr. Fraser to resign. An informal resignation was sent to the Speaker; he (the Attorney-General) pointed out the statute under which the formal resignation required to be drawn up. With reference to the charges brought against him about proceedings at Ottawa it was quite enough there for them to deal with questions before the House without alluding to questions connected with another administration. If the hon. member had any charges to bring against him with regard to the House at Ottawa it would be for him to reply to them on the floor of the House at Ottawa. In reference to the Intercolonial, the hon. gentleman had charged him with being almost the cause of imposing upon the country the north shore route. Did not the hon. gentleman recollect that in 1862 a delegation was sent to England, composed of Mr. Scotte and Mr. Howland, to treat with England in reference to the north shore road, and there was no complaint made at that time by the hon. gentleman's party with reference thereto. Did he not recollect that his leader, the Hon. Geo. Brown, said he would rather have seven Intercolonial Railways than that the Confederation scheme should be dropped? He (the Attorney-General) had seen the report of the engineer who surveyed the north shore route, and had thought it was not his duty to gainsay the decision of the Dominion Government on the subject. With regard to the Nova Scotia expenses, the hon. gentleman charged him with having allowed Nova Scotia to get an undue share of public money. He would challenge the hon. gentleman to prove that, except in one instance, an objection was taken to an item brought down with regard to customs and excise duties in Nova Scotia, an item of \$700 was proposed to be deducted from the customs appropriation for that Province, but he had thought that considering the many indentations of the coast, it was probably necessary that a larger sum should be devoted for the purpose of customs than in other Provinces.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the item of \$700 was in connection with a branch of the Finance Department, not in connection with the customs.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the item was so small that he did not think it worth while to make difficulty about. The other was in respect of the extra gra-