

not proceed to enforce the payment of the Municipal Loan Fund Debt, and the Government felt themselves compelled to hold a sum in hand to enable them to deal with that question. It was felt, however, that it was their duty to set apart a portion of that surplus to be devoted to the aid of railways and public works for the purpose of opening up the back country. In the next place, the Government contemplated the appropriation of \$1,500,000 in developing that portion of the country from which so large a revenue was derived in the form of timber dues.

It being now six o'clock the House adjourned till half-past seven.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS resumed, and explained the position held by the Government last session, and the circumstances which led them to deal with the surplus as they had done, and alluded to the policy of the member for Bruce, and its having been voted down by the House. He then went on to show the mode in which guarantees were offered to the public that the Railway Aid Fund should be properly dealt with. He claimed that the case of 1849 was a corresponding case with this, although one was a loan and the other a gift or bonus. In both cases the Governments were entrusted with power to say which line of railway should be benefited. The very object of that Bill was to enable the companies to go to the municipalities and say that they had Government grant promised, and on that ground to claim municipal grants and private subscriptions. He did not think it desirable as a general rule to leave large sums of money in the hands of the Government for disposal, but he thought it was impossible to avoid that in dealing with the railway aid question. How was it possible for the Government in the face of the restrictions imposed upon them by the Act, to make any improper use of the money? It was simply imposing on the good sense of the people to endeavor to make them believe this. A minority of the House was now attempting to pass a resolution upon an Act which had been passed by an overwhelming majority. The charge was that the Government, in attempting to carry out that Act, were attempting a usurpation. He characterized that as downright nonsense. It was not fair nor honest for a party with only 37 votes, to attempt to oust the Government when a considerable number of the constituencies were unrepresented. That appeared to him to be conduct more properly deserving the term usurpation. He challenged the hon. gentleman to show any precedent due to the House to return an address to the speech from the Throne, and according to modern British practice it was customary to pass the address without attempting to enforce an amendment on the Government. If the hon. gentlemen were of opinion that the Government did not possess the confidence of the House it was their duty to raise that issue on a separate motion. The proper course for the Government was, in view of the prospect of the elections, to pay due regard to the rights of their supporters and of themselves, and it was for them to come to the decision which appeared to them to be correct. The hon. gentleman represented that because there was an adverse vote that therefore they were not competent to advise the crown. It was quite clear that that position was untenable. The question was whether the Government in the exercise of its judgment was not competent to form an opinion whether, in the present position of the House and with the "practical" place, the position was favorable to them. On the best information that he could get, he thought the Government were perfectly justified in holding their seats and waiting the course of the elections. He did not think that the Government could honestly take any other course. Suppose they gave place to hon. gentlemen opposite, and the elections turned out as the Government expected they would do, what reasonable prospect would the hon. gentlemen opposite have of being able to carry on the Government? They certainly could not do so without changing the opinions of some hon. members on this side of the House. The Government were not justified in resigning until by a vote of non-confidence, passed by a full House, their conduct had been censured. If hon. gentlemen opposite had the confidence of the House, why should they object to permit the Government to remain in office, doing nothing more than was absolutely necessary for the purpose of carrying on Government? The hon. gentleman had said that the Government had been defeated on other occasions—once on the proposal for adjournment, and again on the railway policy; but it did not follow that the Government should think it necessary to resign. There was an instance of a British Government remaining in power five years, during which period it was defeated 160 times. If that was the case he did not see that there was any cogency in the argument that because this Government had suffered three defeats, therefore, they must retire. He had been invited by the hon. member for South Bruce as an individual member of the Government to resign. He did not consider that any man assuming public office was at liberty, on mere personal considerations, to throw off his responsibilities. He believed that when he entered upon the arrangement under which the coalition had been formed, he was bound fairly and honestly to carry it out. He did not think that he should be fairly carrying it out if he were now to resign in consequence of a majority of one against the Government in a House where a number of constituencies were not represented. He did not think he could retain his self-respect if he were to do so. Honor and good faith in his opinion required him to remain where he was, and he intended to do so; and if the vote of the House of this question should result in a repetition of that majority of one against them, he should retain his position.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that the members of the Government seemed to think that because they had the confidence of the last House they should have the confidence of this. The great question un-

which the country was appealed to was whether the Government should have the excessive power entrusted to them under this Railway Act or not, and the answer of the Government was that they should not. The reference to the argument that the control of the Railway Fund by the House would create "bog-trotting," was answered, he said, by the fact, that in Canadian Parliaments a motion for the expenditure of public money could not be introduced by a private member. He then went on to refer to the corrupting influences brought to bear by the Government in respect to the placing of public buildings. No one accused the hon. gentlemen with personal corrupt practices; but he objected to the Government on the ground that their whole public acts have been based on the desire to strengthen the Government. He then alluded to precedent to show that several Ministers had resigned on smaller provocation than was now offered the gentleman opposite, and quoted the case of Lord John Russell, who retired on a vote of 312 to 311, although he had not a minority of the whole House. Hon. gentlemen opposite had no right to advise His Excellency to say that he would give the matter consideration; neither common sense or decency would justify their course.

ATTY-GEN. MACDONALD asked if the hon. gentleman opposite denied the right of a Ministry voted in the House to advise as to the future course to be adopted, and alluded to the case of Sir Francis Hincks in '54 who advised Lord Elgin to prorogue the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that the hon. gentleman had not advised to dissolve the House and dare not do so. He then proceeded to argue the constitutional question and said that the Government, although its policy had been condemned, had forced the Opposition to another appeal to His Excellency. Hon. gentlemen opposite now asked the House to adjourn without taking a vote of credit as it had been done last year very properly, because they were not in a position to advise the application of that supply.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that the hon. gentleman had applied the term factionist to him. Any man to whom that term was really applicable deserved condemnation. He (Mr. Cameron) entered Parliament as an independent member, with the determination to support only such measures as he considered would be beneficial to the country. The Government at that time comprised several hon. gentlemen now on the opposite side of the House, and as the measures which they then brought forward appeared to him to be of that nature, he had then supported them. In the matter of the resolutions then introduced, his conduct was altogether inconsistent with party feeling. As he understood the constitutional question, a Government was entitled to stand or fall, according to the will of the people expressed by their representatives; but if there was not a clear majority of a full House, he held that such a decision was not expressed. He did not like this to be made a mere scramble for office; no Government should pretend to govern unless supported by the voice of the people. Did hon. gentleman opposite think that the majority of one which they claimed would be sufficient to enable them to carry on the Government. If the result of the elections should be to place the Government in a decided minority, there was not a member of it who would wish to retain his seat against the will of the people. Suppose that a Government had failed to carry out a railway communication between the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa, and to offer a subsidy of \$10,000 a mile, and came down to the House to ask authority for such grant, but without naming the exact points where such railway should begin or terminate, would there be anything unconstitutional or usurping in that? Now this example was precisely similar to the case now brought before the House in the legislation of previous Sessions. That legislation had received the approval of Reformers of that day; and he believed the Opposition now brought against that principle originated in party feeling alone. He had been glad to hear the hon. member for West Middlesex say that he had no intention of bringing any charge of corruption against individual members of the Government. Mr. Cameron then read an extract from a report of a speech by the hon. member for Welland.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE said he had never employed those expressions.

Mr. CAMERON said it was by allowing such statements as this to remain uncontradicted that the Opposition had obtained their majority of one. This majority had been obtained by catching the votes of members who were pledged on the railway question, or who had formed the belief that the Government was seeking to obtain the million and a half for their own purposes. No doubt hon. gentlemen were clever tacticians, and they had succeeded by these means in obtaining a semblance of a majority against the Government. If non-confidence were voted in the Government on the ground that the measures foreshadowed in the speech were not satisfactory, it would be a fair and square issue. But hon. gentlemen should be content to wait until the elections came off—it would be little more than a fortnight—then if the result of those elections was to show that the Government had not the confidence of the country they would resign. He could say fearlessly that except for the honor of the position which was given to him unsolicited he cared not how soon he resigned. He had in no manner sought for the office or endeavored to get the position which he held as Provincial Secretary, but it was offered to him without his taking any step or mentioning or suggesting to a living soul that he was desirous of having a place in the Government, and being so given to him he felt that there was an honor and trust reposed in him that he should not neglect. That trust was, in the first instance, to serve the interests of the country to the best of his ability, and he trusted he had not failed to do so, (cheers); and the other interest that was imposed upon him, was that he should not give up the position entrusted to him unless the people of the country desired that he should do so, and

unless he was satisfied that the majority of the people took the view as represented, and he would not be doing his duty to the people of the country at large unless he supported out that interest also. Of course, if hon. members who were elected to support the Government chose to desert, there was no alternative to them but to vacate their seats; and the very moment that the Government was conscious that they had not the confidence of the people of the country, it would be disgraceful; it would be as disgraceful as the hon. member for West Middlesex spoke of, if they retained power for a moment. But until they were satisfied of that fact, it would be just as disgraceful in them to surrender the control of the affairs of the country into other hands, those hands being those which have been endeavoring to get it by the means that have been taken to accomplish this end—not by a fair and square vote of want of confidence, not by the Opposition taking up the Governor's speech and saying that the matters there set forth were such as to show that the advisers of the Crown did not possess the confidence of the people, but by a side issue respecting the railway policy, which would be a matter of dispute even among the hon. gentlemen themselves. Some of them approved of setting apart a large amount to our railways. Another hon. gentleman was opposed to this proposal, while another gentleman, not knowing the circumstances, said that the Government were claiming too much power. Having made such a declaration to his constituents he felt bound by it, and the hon. gentleman opposite has so manipulated the motion as to necessitate that he should vote for the first resolution, but he voted against their non-confidence resolution. Now, was it becoming the dignity of the Opposition, was it worthy of a man who claimed to be an honest politician to seek place and power without being satisfied that he had the confidence of the people? Suppose that instead of eight members being absent there had been forty constituencies unrepresented, and they had a majority of two—twenty voting for the Government and twenty-two voting against it—would it be reasonable to say that the Government should go out and place power in the hands of the Opposition when the House was so unrepresented? It did not signify whether it was forty that was out of the House or it was eight. The number that was out did not change the majority. The Government claimed that six out of eight of the constituencies unrepresented would return supporters.

Mr. MACKENZIE. "No."

Mr. CAMERON said Prescott had returned Mr. Hamilton, a strong Government supporter; Stormont returned Mr. Colquhoun, a supporter of the Government; Prince Edward returned Mr. Striker, an opponent; Carleton had two candidates, both of whom were declared supporters of the Government; Mr. Monk was returned as a supporter of the Government. In North Simcoe there were two candidates, Mr. Ardagh and Mr. Lount, and they carried a majority of over a thousand. In South Grey Mr. Lauder, one of the martyrs, was returned as a supporter of the Government with a large majority of 538. In Northumberland, Mr. Fraser had a majority of 96 over Mr. Gifford, and the hon. member for South Bruce was elected by acclamation in Durham. That was the position in which the matter stood. Hon. gentlemen so was not so why were gentlemen seemed to be anxious that the Government should ask for a vote of credit, and he forgot to say that last year the vote was asked for not merely to cover the holidays but for some time beyond. He (Mr. Cameron) presumed that the country could get on very well for a week—its obligations would not suffer for that short time. He claimed that it was not the duty of the Opposition to raise cries of technical and sentimental objections to the proceedings of the Government, but rather to try and aid it in doing its best for the interests of the country. After an able defence of the Government policy as to the location of public buildings, he went on to say that he had never used any unfair or undue means of influencing hon. members. He had always tried to convince members of both sides of the House by arguments addressed openly to the House, and had not tried to button-hole members of the opposite side of the Chamber, a practice, he was sorry to say, which prevailed among gentlemen on the other side of the House. He was quite prepared to resign when once it was proven that the Government did not possess the confidence of the House. (Cheers.)

Mr. FAREWELL said that it was upon this very railway policy of the Government that the late elections had turned, and on that issue the Government had been defeated. With reference to the proposed adjournment, it was evident that the Government had not thought of taking that step until the Atty-Genl. took the step of drawing up an amendment to that effect, which was placed in the hands of an hon. member.

Mr. McCALL said that the charge had been brought against him of bringing forward an amendment drawn up by the Attorney-General. He (McCall) emphatically denied that. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. FAREWELL accepted that denial, and went on to refer to the term "cast iron pledge," which had been made use of by some speakers, and many hon. members knew that expression had been made use of with special reference to him. Now he could not see that it was any worse for an hon. member to pledge himself to oppose the Government than to pledge himself to support it. Mr. Farewell went on to attack the policy of the Government with respect to the recognition of the institution at Hamilton; and argued that that institution had been closed and another site selected in order to gain a supporter for the Government. He defended the conduct of the Reformers of South Ontario in selecting a candidate who bound himself to take every reasonable occasion to oppose the Government, in opposition to a candidate who undertook to support the Government. He thought that if the Government had not been defeated on their railway policy they would have deserved to be defeated for not devoting more attention to the promotion of immigration.

Mr. CUMBERLAND rose to explain. In alluding to the cast-iron pledge, he had not objected to any hon. gentleman pledging himself to his electors, but to such a pledge being given to political leaders.

Mr. PRINCE thought the constitutional question had been pretty well argued out, and that it had been decided in favor of his (the Opposition) side of the House. If he understood the hon. member for Algoma correctly, the House could not comment on past legislation; but what else was the House to comment upon?

Mr. CUMBERLAND explained that he had only referred to legislation of the particular class and under the particular circumstances which had been brought under discussion.

Mr. PRINCE continued. The threat of a dissolution had been held out to hon. members supporting the Government.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON denied that he had held out such a threat. He had merely referred to a suppositious case in which a Government might be authorized in taking such a step.

Mr. PRINCE went on to speak of the railway aid question. The Great Western Railway had been referred to, but there was no similarity between the case of that road and the lines to which aid was now proposed to be given.

Mr. McCALL said he recollected an instance illustrating the effect of a cast-iron pledge in the last Parliament, when nine members had left the House rather than vote upon a measure upon which they were pledged. With reference to the charges which had been brought against him, he had to say that no approaches had been made to him by any member of the Government. He had thought that the House as now constituted was not in a position to decide upon the questions at issue, but a vote of the House having settled that question, he bowed to its decision, although he had given the Government an independent support, but he felt that they should not press upon him for another vote after that expression of the House. Therefore, it would please him better to see the Atty-General withdraw his motion, and the hon. member for South Bruce withdraw his, on the understanding that the Cabinet should retire. The constitutional question was a most important one, and the eyes of the British Empire were upon them; therefore they should not stand upon technicalities, but deal with the question on broad principles. He had now discharged his duty to his constituents and to the Province, and if he should be compelled to vote again he should vote according to the dictates of his conscience, and that must be for the original motion.

Mr. PAXTON had opposed the railway policy of the Government for the last four years and opposed it still, notwithstanding the aid his constituency would receive from that fund. He considered the Atty-General was attempting to cling to power in defiance of the decision of the House and the will of the people.

Mr. BLAKE said that the motion of the Atty-General had already been really disposed of by the decision of the House on the amendment of the hon. member for South Norfolk. At the time the hon. Atty-General had a great majority in that House he had not ventured upon such an infraction of constitutional practice as now. He was now asking the House to assent to a proposition which it would not have permitted this time last year. He had been amused at the remarks made on the impropriety of commenting on past legislation, but the speech was full of references to past legislation. With regard to this railway aid question, however, they were not dealing with past legislation, the money was not gone, and it was still open to them to interfere with its disposal. The hon. Atty-General had challenged them to a direct vote of confidence, and on that challenge they had acted. A dissolution had also been hinted at, and one would soon take place, not, however, a dissolution of the House, but a dissolution of the Government. He was not extremely anxious about it; he was merely fulfilling the pledge he gave last year. The pledge which he then gave he had now fulfilled.

The ATTY-GENERAL said he had been twitted with regard to a vote which he had taken this time last year when he obtained a vote of \$200,000 on supply. Such a vote was not asked for now on account of the pledge which had been given, that if they were to remain as they were until after the holidays they should not use one farthing of public money. If the Government received that support which they expected at the coming elections they should then be prepared to come down to the House at the earliest possible period and ask for the necessary supply. He was prepared to take the consequence of the vote that would be taken that evening, and hoped he would be prepared to bow to the decision of the House.

Mr. BOULTBEE felt it due to himself to give his reasons for supporting the amendment. He did not vote for it on the ground of want of confidence in the Government, because he did not feel that. He voted for this amendment because it appeared to him that they were bound to abide by the decision of the House, and although the majority against the Government was only a small one still it was a majority. It might perhaps be many years before they would have an administration that looked so closely after the interests of the country as this administration had done. He felt that he had no right to press his opinions against the will of the House, and therefore he must vote against the Government.

The amendment of the hon. Atty-Gen. was then put to the House, and on a division the numbers appeared to be yeas 26, nays, 48.

YEAS—Messrs. Boulter, Calvin, Cameron, Carling, Clark, (Grenville), Code, Corby, Craig, (Glenzart), Craig, (Russell), Cumberland, Deroche, Fitzsimons, Graham, Grange, Guest, Harrington, Macdonald, (Carnwall), Macdonald, (Leeds), McCallum, McRae, Monteith, Richards, Rykert, Scott, (Grey), Tooley, Williams, (Durham).—36.

NAYS—Messrs. Baxter, Blake, Boulbee, Christie, Clarke, (Wellington), Clarke, (Newfolk), Clements, Cook, Crooks, Currie, Dawson, Deaton, Fairbairn, Farewell, Finlayson, Galbraith, Gibbons, Gibson, Gov, Hodgins, McCall, (Newfolk), MacKenzie, McKellar, McKim, McMaas, Merrick, Oliver, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Perry, Prince, Robinson, Sexton, Sinclair, Smith, Springer,