

FRIDAY, Jan. 19, 1872.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:15.
NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. McCuaig and Mr. Bethune having been sworn in were introduced and took their seats.

PETITIONS.

The following were presented:—

By Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Petition of the City Council of Ottawa, praying for the passage of an Act to enable them to raise money.

By Mr. RYKERT—Petition of Thos. T. Nellis, of Ottawa, and others, praying for the passing of an Act to enable them to sell certain lands.

By Mr. WILLIAMS—Petition of the Hamilton Horticultural Society, praying aid.

By Mr. McLEOD—Petition of the Township Council of Manvers, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Bowmanville, Lindsay and Bobcaygeon Railway.

By Mr. PERRY—Petition of Alex. McCleneghan and others, of Woodstock, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize them to purchase and hold real estate for the purpose of temperance.

By Mr. McCALLUM—Petition of David E. Winslow and others, of Cauborough, praying that Commissioners may be appointed to make a certain survey.

By Mr. MONTEITH—Petition of the Township Council of Logan, praying for the passing of an Act to enable them to pass a by-law repealing certain by-laws.

By Mr. MONTEITH—Petition of Geo. Ney and others, of Ellice, praying for the passing of an Act to invest certain property in them, as the trustees of the First Evangelical Lutheran, St. John's Congregation, of Ellice.

By Mr. FAIRBAIRN—Petition of Henry Ludgate and others, of Peterboro, praying for certain amendments to the game law.

By Mr. FAIRBAIRN—Petition of Henry Collins and others, of Peterboro, praying for the repeal of so much of sec. 2 of cap. 48, 34 Vic., as affects a by-law of the county of Peterboro.

By Mr. FAIRBAIRN—Petition of Mr. Boyd and others, of Bobcaygeon, praying for an Act of Incorporation.

By Mr. CLEMENS—Petition of the County Council of Waterloo, praying for certain amendments to the municipal law.

By Mr. BOULTER—Petition of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario, praying for certain amendments to the Dentistry Act.

By Mr. DEACON—Petition of the Kingston & Pembroke Railway Company, praying for the passing of an Act to legalize certain by-laws.

COMMITTEES.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE presented the report of the Committee appointed to strike the Standing Committees, which was adopted by the House after a short discussion.

PRIVATE BILLS.

On motion of Mr. PRINCE, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Leeds), leave was given to introduce a Bill for the incorporation of the Canada Southern Railway.

On motion of Mr. McLEOD permission was given to introduce a Bill for incorporation of the Bowmanville, Lindsay and Bobcaygeon Railway.

MR. SCOTT'S EXPLANATION.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT was sorry to find that the hon. member for Cornwall was not present, however he was prepared to make the statement which he had promised. Those charges which he was about to answer had been brought against him behind his back; it was an unmanly act to do so, it was contrary to all parliamentary practice. It was dishonorable to speak of a man behind his back or to thus attempt to defame the character of a man. Those charges had fallen harmless before the House and the country. He (Mr. Scott) had a name and a reputation in the country before the hon. gentleman who made these charges had entered the House; and had been elected over and over again by acclamation by the city which he had the honor to represent; and the fact that he now occupied that seat was the best answer to those charges. And those other constituencies which had been appealed to had also given an emphatic answer to those charges. But occupying as he did a position of trust in the Administration of Ontario it was due to the people that he should answer the charges which had been made; and in doing so, in consequence of the absence of the leader of the late Government, he should not be able to enter into all the matters so fully as he otherwise should do. The first charge made against him on the occasion of moving for the issue of a new writ for the Ottawa election was that he (Mr. Scott) was not a safe person to be entrusted with the department which he had been placed in charge of on account of his connection with the lumber interests; and that statement had been repeated by the hon. member for East Toronto. He (Scott) said emphatically and distinctly that the charge implied in that statement was not true. He had had occasion to speak fully on the subject of the lumber trade, and his views on that subject had been enunciated in the interests of the people of Ontario. He thoroughly knew the value of that great interest to the country; and on some future occasion would take an opportunity of laying his views on that subject before the House. But that was not the subject now under discussion. He had been called a paid advocate of that interest, but he said distinctly that he was not. During the last twenty years that he had been professionally engaged at Ottawa the average business of his firm with those connected with that interest had not exceeded \$50 per annum. In 1858 he had acted for a lumber firm, and in 189 also in connection with the English Colonization Company; with those exceptions he had not been employed in any case of importance by that trade. When Confederation took place he had accompanied a

deputation to Quebec, but he did not go there as a representative of that interest, but simply in a professional capacity. He now distinctly stated that he was not the professional adviser of any man in that trade. Another charge which had been made was that he had accepted fees for supporting the passage of a particular bill. Hon. Mr. CAMERON denied that he had made an allusion to that matter, but it was so stated by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT stated distinctly that he had never received one farthing in the whole course of his political life for any such purpose. On the contrary, the private bills which he had introduced into that House had been a source of expense to him. He would challenge the most minute enquiry into his conduct in that respect. These statements had been circulated through the country by the press. He felt that the press ought to have the greatest possible license and liberty of speech, and the power of keenly criticising the acts of public men; and he trusted that the press would circulate the reply as widely as the charge had been. The result of his joining the Administration had been to bring to it a certain amount of support, he said it without vanity; and that was why the press had called in question the propriety of that step. He would show, however, that he was perfectly justified in taking that course. With reference to the charge as to his connection with the Canada Central he would read the exact words which had been made use of by the Premier of the late Government. (Mr. Scott proceeded to read the passages in question, and after some consultation with his colleagues, proceeded.) Hon. gentlemen would bear with him while he gave briefly the history of the Canada Central. In 1854 the then Government desiring to encourage railway enterprise, appropriated some four millions of acres of the Crown lands for a railway from Quebec to Lake Huron. However, nothing was done for six years. In 1860 a bill was introduced, and in the following year passed through Parliament without any opposition from Hon. Mr. Macdonald, a bill providing for the division of these lands among the separate railway companies—the North Shore, the Ottawa Valley, the Ottawa and Arnprior, and the Ottawa Central. Under that subdivision those companies were entitled to their share after 20 miles of railway was completed. But notwithstanding the aid which those companies received, they found it impossible, in consequence of the depreciated state of Canadian securities, to make any progress. He then proceeded to give a history of the Canada Central railway, in which he denied having any personal interest, but that the route taken in its construction was perfectly in consistence with economical administration. He would emphatically deny being one of a band of speculators in any such scheme. He then made a lengthy attack upon the late Government, and especially upon the late Premier. There was not a constituency in Canada that could confirm the acts of the late Attorney-General. He then proceeded to vindicate a charge which he said had been made against him in accepting the Speakership of the House at the beginning of this session. There had been at the close of the last session last year an understanding that he was to be the Speaker for this session. He had not heard anything more on the subject since that time until about three weeks before the House met when he was in Toronto, and the Attorney-General had told him that he was the choice of the people of Ontario as the Speaker for the session. He then heard that it had been offered of the Speakership, but he had afterwards warned the late Atty.-General that he had better be careful, for as yet he was perfectly free. He had then informed the hon. member from London that he had not accepted the position of Speaker, and that he would not take the chair. He was afterwards obliged to take the chair for fear of the late Attorney-General. He then read a telegram which had been addressed by the Hon. John Carling to the late Hon. Atty.-General, dated Dec. 4th, which was an enquiry as to whether he (Mr. Scott) had accepted the Speakership, and also another on the 5th having the same purport. The position had either been offered to him as a trap, or the Government had agreed to it. He would then answer the question "Had he been guilty of any impropriety in accepting a position in the present Government." He did not believe in self-conversion, and he did not believe any other gentleman in the House did so either. He did not owe the late Government anything, but they owed him much. He had taken a certain course, which he believed to be a right one. He could not agree in voting with the late Premier. He had been a politician without a policy. He had never favored Confederation in any sense, and when it was effected it was done so with a grudging vote from the late Government. He was sorry that it had ever been said that any Government had to be supported by bribery and corruption. He had said on his late return to Ottawa that he would rather remain out of political life than give his support to the late Government. Up to the Saturday of the second week at the last meeting of the House he had expressed no opinion upon the course that the late Government was taking. He had then expressed his disapprobation of the conduct of the late Premier in not resigning his late position. He stated emphatically that a nomination of the ex-Premier had no chance of election in 1871. Then why was this charge to be brought against him. When his hon. friend was called on to form an Administration he quite unexpectedly came to him (Mr. Scott) and asked him to take part in that Administration. He took time for consideration, and after discussing the subjects likely to arise in the House he found that on those subjects his view were in accordance with the hon. gentleman's. The policy proposed was discussed between them; as regards the dependence of the Administration on that House, his views were entirely in agreement with those of the hon. Premier. The hon. Premier had not sought in any way to change his (Mr. Scott's) views with regard to his position towards the De-

partment Government. He (Scott) found that he could enter the Administration without sacrificing a single opinion. Could it then be called a Coalition. (Hear, hear, from the Opposition.) Hon. gentleman might call it a Coalition, but he could appeal to the example of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Cardwell and other members of the British Government. Were those gentlemen ever charged with inconsistency. (Hear, hear, from the Opposition.) There was no open question between him and the hon. Premier; he gave the hon. Premier a true and loyal support; he had not taken that step without due consideration, and would be true to that course to the end. If he had not entered the Government he very much feared that a sectional cry would have gone forth. He believed that that Government which represented all classes was the strongest. He claimed to be a representative man, and that there were hon. members who shared his views. He might expect to be made a target for the sneers of hon. members opposite, but he cared nothing for them. He had been elected not as a representative of the lumber interests but in spite of them, but that would not prevent him from giving due regard to their interests. He trusted that he should not be again called upon to repel these charges. Mr. Scott then read several letters he had received in reply to circulars which had been addressed to the license holders with respect to the charges brought against him of having been employed as the paid advocate of the lumberers. He had refrained from going into some matters which he might have touched upon, but he gave fair notice that if these charges were repeated he would give full explanations.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON explained the observations he had made on the previous day and proceeded. He wished to know the real position of the hon. member. Was he a Conservative, or was he not?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT would like to have a clear definition of what Conservative principles were before replying to that.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON supposed it must be taken that the hon. gentleman refused to say to which party he belonged. He was not asking for a definition, but for an answer to a plain question.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that he endorsed in every particular the speech of his hon. friend the Premier.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that when such different explanations were given the House had a right to a complete explanation. Had the hon. Commissioner for Crown Lands undertaken to bring another Conservative into the Cabinet with him?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I did not.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON would inquire if there was not a deputation of lumbermen for the purpose of making certain arrangements with respect to the lumbering interests at which the hon. gentleman was present?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said certainly he was present on that occasion with several other members of the House. That meeting was for the purpose of conferring with the late Government on the subject of their timber policy. He went to the Atty.-General and desired to obtain an interview for that deputation, but the hon. gentleman absolutely declined to do so. They then endeavoured to obtain an interview with the Commissioner of Crown Lands but without success.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON would like to know whether that meeting had a declared policy with regard to the timber question; and whether that policy was the policy advocated by the hon. gentleman?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT was prepared to go into that matter at the proper time. That deputation had simply desired to lay before the Government their views with respect to the removal of the timber license.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON asked had the lumbermen desired to have the land in fee simple?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said no; they desired not to be in the position of being liable to have their licenses cancelled at any moment. With the exceptions of one meeting at Ottawa and another at Toronto, he had not been present at any meetings held in connection with the lumber interests.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that he had been represented as attaching no importance to the presence of the hon. member for Cornwall, but so far from that he attached great importance to it. It had been said that that hon. gentleman now had no followers, but the country would remember his thirty years' services. He (Mr. Cameron) regretted the absence of the hon. the late Commissioner of Crown Lands, who was more acquainted with the details of that department. The hon. gentlemen (Mr. Scott) had declined to state whether he was a Conservative; there could be but one motive for that; but he was surprised to find that a member of that party could be ashamed to deny his colours. The hon. Treasurer had described him as a Reformer, who had returned to his first love. (Laughter.) He (Mr. Cameron) wanted to know what constituted a Pure Party Government; was it a Government formed by Conservative and Reformer uniting to carry out certain principles, on which they were agreed? If so the late Government was a Pure Party Government! But hon. gentlemen opposite contended that that could not be done without violating principles in a manner obnoxious to the constitution. He was not going to attack the hon. Commissioner for joining the Reformers; he had all along maintained that there was nothing hurtful to the interests of the country in a union of Conservatives and Reformers. That principle had been attacked on the other side of the House, and not only by hon. gentlemen there, but throughout the country; and he proposed to show that by reading extracts from the declarations of every one of those gentlemen. Mr. Cameron then read an extract from the *Globe* of July 17, 1867. Hon. gentlemen would see that the late premier then refused to form a Coalition on the ground that it was not then required. He then read another extract from the *Globe* of July 22. That, he continued, was the cry with which hon. gentlemen went to the country at the last election, and yet they had now done the very thing which they then denounced as an impropriety.