

Mr. ROBINSON—To incorporate the Kingston Board of Trade.

Mr. CHRISTIE—to enable the Town of Dundas to close a certain street.

Hon. Mr. CARLING—To amend the Act respecting the City Gas Company of the City of London.

The following were read first time and referred to the Railway Committee.

Hon. Mr. CARLING—To amend the Act respecting the London, Huron & Bruce Railway Company.

The following were read a first time and the second reading fixed for Friday.

Dr. CLARKE—To amend the Act of the Land Trusts of Upper Canada Company.

Mr. BETHUNE—To amend the law respecting Public Schools.

Also—To amend the law respecting the issue of the prerogative writ of mandamus.

The following were read a first time and ordered for second reading to-morrow:

Hon. Mr. BLAKE—To make further provision touching the election of members to the Legislative Assembly.

Also—Respecting the institution of suits against the Crown and proceedings in Crown suits.

Hon. Mr. CAWKS—To amend the Act relating to registrations of co-partnerships.

Also—To enable law fees in territorial districts to be paid by law stamps.

GAME LAWS.

Mr. PRINCE moved that Messrs. Deacon, Williams (Hamilton), Wood (Victoria), and Wilson be added to the Committee on the Game Laws. Carried.

MR. WOOD'S RESIGNATION.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved that a Committee be appointed, to consist of Messrs. Ardagh, Boulter, Boulter, Fitzsimmons, Pardee, Prince, Clarke, (Wellington), Perry and Farewell, under the resolution adopted by the House with respect to the resignation of the Hon. E. B. Wood.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON rose to protest against the course taken by hon. members. The resolution now referred to was not the resolution he brought forward, and the object of the Government was simply to stifle enquiry by appointing a committee composed of a majority of those favorable to the accused. He therefore refused to proceed any further in the matter.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said that the committee would investigate the charges fairly.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD thought it too bad of the Government to take such a course. Why did the Government refuse to leave the resolution with the same scope as it had been originally moved, instead of limiting it as they had done.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that he had invited the hon. member to bring specific charges against any or all members of the Government.

Mr. CAMERON said he had stated that he had information with respect to one other member of the Government, but that he declined then to mention his name.

The motion was then carried.

MUNICIPAL LOAN FUND.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE laid on the table certain returns with respect to this fund.

THE RAILWAY FUND.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE moved the second reading of the Bill to make further provision touching the appropriation of the Railway Fund, and doing so observed that the object of the Government in introducing this measure was to amend, not to repeal, previous legislation. The principle of the Bill had already been approved by the House in a most decisive manner. It was unnecessary, therefore, to discuss its provisions, but there was one point he wished to refer to. It had been said that it would introduce the American system of logrolling, and interfere with the responsibility of the Government. Now the Government alone had the right under the British system which was here adopted to initiate monetary grants, whether to railway or other corporations. That had been the practice in this House up to the time at which the late Government introduced another system. If there was any difficulty in the determining of any matter of this kind by the House it would exist *a fortiori* more completely in decisions by any five members of the House. The Government did not doubt that their measures would meet with the candid consideration of the House.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had accused the Government of which he (Mr. Macdonald) was formerly a member of seeking to aggrandize themselves at the expense of the House and of desiring to employ, for the purpose of corrupting constituencies, the million and a half railway fund. That charge was without any foundation whatever; every cent of the money was in the public treasury. The House must consider the circumstances under which the railway policy of the late Government had come into force, and reminded the House that under the former legislation railway enterprise had become greatly developed. He maintained that that policy was far more favorable to the promotion of such enterprises than that now proposed. There had been no attempt on the part of the late Government to interfere with the proper control of the House over the public funds. So far from any favoritism toward their supporters the late Government, in the cases in which they had authorized grants in aid of railways whose promoters had been their most unflinching supporters, had fixed the grants at the minimum figure per mile. The result of that policy had been a great revival of railway enterprise, many of which would come before the House for grants; but those which did not succeed in obtaining aid would have to wait until the next session of Parliament before being able to take any further steps.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that the statements of the hon. Premier implied a wilful misapprehension of the course which had been proposed by the late Government. That Government had merely desired to act upon the authority given to them by the House under the Railway Aid Act. Under the new policy it would be those who could bring most pressure on the Government who would have the best chance of getting the money; whereas the principle of the late Government was to consider each scheme on its merits and "First come, first served." The result of that policy was to encourage railway enterprise, and it was a just and a creditable policy. With regard to this Bill, he found it brought forward by a Government one of whose members had formerly voted against the policy now inaugurated; he referred to the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands. It was not his intention to divide the House but he would protest against the action of the Government in thus shirking their responsibility.

Mr. T. FERGUSON thought that the House should be careful to see that the responsibility should not be shirked by those to whom it properly belonged. Serious charges had been brought against the Government, about which there was much difference of opinion in the country, but the House was now called upon to repose trust in this immaculate Government. He believed the result of their policy would be to retard the development of the country by throwing obstacles in the way of the opening up of the land. He thought it very doubtful whether any attempt would be made to initiate railway schemes between the adjournment of Parliament and the next session.

Hon. E. B. WOOD was quite willing to take the responsibility of anything which had been done by the late Government; he thought that Government might have been open to criticism in some departments, but there was no point in their policy which could be fairly attacked except this railway fund. Now he had never denied the right of the House to a full control over the public money, and he did not think that principle had ever been denied in that or in the British Parliament. As a member of the late Government he totally repudiated the idea that they had any idea of arrogating to themselves the responsibility at their own will of that million and a half. The limits of their discretionary power were so well defined that they could not go beyond them; and the same discretionary limits would remain in force now. The supposition that the American logrolling system might be thus introduced was mere bush. (Laughter.) So far from that being the case the Government now proposed to take the full responsibility of recommending grants.

Mr. CUMBERLAND wanted to know if the view of Ministerial responsibility laid down by the last speaker was accepted by the Government; if so he thought they would find themselves in a fix. A well defined responsibility was imposed on the Government by the previous legislation but the policy now proposed gave the Government an opportunity of shirking the proper responsibility. If the House divided he should vote against the Bill. The House then took the usual recess.

After Recess.

Mr. RYKERT said the questions involved in the Bill had been so plainly set before the House that it was not necessary to further discuss them. He entertained the same opinion with respect to the Bill that he had previously expressed, and should feel it his duty to vote against it if

it came to a division. There was a most important omission in the Bill with respect to the giving notice of orders in Council in the *Gazette*, and if that omission was not rectified he would bring forward a motion on the subject. The hon. Premier now ridiculed the idea of the log rolling system being introduced into the House, but he had on previous occasions expressed a fear of that being the case. He (Mr. Rykert) feared that the Government policy would have the effect of crushing out enterprise. He hoped the House would leave to the Government the responsibility of passing the Bill through the House. There were Bills carried through the House, which hon. gentlemen voted for, not because there was any great principle in the Bill, but because they knew they could assist each other to carry Bills through the House.

Hon. Mr. WOOD explained that he had said if it was fixed definitely by Act of Parliament what was to be done, the matter would be placed beyond the discretion of both the House and the Government.

Mr. PRINCE could not see what was the object of continuing the debate, as those opposing the bill had expressed the wish not to press the matter to a division.

Mr. S. C. WOOD (Victoria) said as large amounts of capital had been invested on the faith of the Act which was passed he had thought it his duty to vote against the amendment of the hon. gentleman when in opposition. But the House had now unmistakably accepted that principle. For himself he had no objection to the principle of the bill; an hon. member had accused them of wilfully misrepresenting the working of the bill, but as far as he could judge he was not aware that that had been done.

Mr. MONK said had he been in the House at the time the railway question was previously discussed in that House he should have supported the amendment of the hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government; and he should now support the Government in carrying out the same principle.

Mr. SEXTON said that he believed in expending money in whatever manner it was in accordance with the wishes of the people.

Mr. DEACON said he thought there ought to be a clause added to the Bill to meet a case where the people refused the railway altogether. He intended to support the motion, but did not consider that it went far enough.

The SPEAKER then put the question that the Bill be now read a second time, and there being no opposition it was declared carried.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE insisted upon the ayes and nays being taken, assuring that there had been a call for a division. However, after some discussion, the Speaker ruled that a division could not then be taken.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE moved the second reading of the Bill to further secure the Independence of the Legislative Assembly, and in doing so said that in this or some other form the same matter was brought before the Legislature several times before and had always been defeated, but on the last occasion with a very small majority, but he had no doubt but that it would now be carried with a large majority. The measure contained a clause which would meet the case of having a President of Council, which office he held. The action that he had taken in this matter was quite consistent. It had been said that by so doing he had been condemned, because in 1867 he had said that the constitution gave the number of Executive Councillors. So it did at that time, but things were now changed, and that clause referred only to the first formation of the Government, and not to the present.

It seemed to him that there could be no reasonable objection to the measure now proposed; he hoped that they would not be called upon to hear the threadbare arguments which had been so many times repeated.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said the hon. gentleman had introduced the Bill in a style to make people believe that it would be the salvation of the country, when after all it only related to the appointment of an arbitrator between some municipalities. He characterized the remarks of the Hon. Premier as an example of extreme special pleading in endeavoring to prove that his conduct in appointing a sixth member of the Executive Council was in accordance with the provisions of the Confederation Act. But people outside would take a different view of that step. There was nothing very novel in the Bill; similar bills had been introduced into the House on many previous occasions. But a clause had been inserted which rendered it possible for an unlimited number of members of that House to become members of the Executive Council. That was a matter on which he should think it his duty to take the opinion of the House. When the Equal Representation Bill came on, the House would have before it the whole programme of the great Liberal party; these matters which had been brought forward were not worthy the name of measures.

Mr. McCALL thought this was a very important measure, and that the last speaker had supplied an argument in favor of its passing. He regretted that the Government, before appointing an extra member of the executive had not taken the opinion of the House, and said it was the last thing he should have expected of those who had maintained so strongly the rights of the House. But he considered the measure now proposed to be sound and would support it.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said that in England it was well known that persons were appointed to high positions of trust who were in opposition to the government. In this country they had gone to a great length in securing an independence act. There was only one door left open, and that was that by statute the Crown had the power of appointing persons to discharge duties which the Government could not control. If they got the money it did not matter to them from whom it came. If there was anything to be made out of these things—if it was possible to raise any scandal about these things, that was all that could be done. He was prepared to support the Bill, but he wanted it passed and hermetically sealed so that no Government or any one else could change it. In regard to the new office, he recollected when some years ago a discussion took place in regard to the appointment. He then sympathized with the leading spirit of the discussion. He remembered very well that then the hon. President of the Council had said that there were on y six or seven members of the Executive Council in the United States, and that in this new country with scarcely four millions of a population it had been proposed to have 13 members in the Executive Council. He did not think the hon. President of the Council was so very wealthy that he could afford to discharge the duties of his office without remuneration, and he had no doubt but that if it was found that the office was to be made a permanent one there would be a salary attached to it as well as to the other offices of the Executive Council.

Mr. FERGUSON thought that if the son or the brother of an hon. member was appointed to an office such hon. member would feel as much bound to support them as if he had received it himself, and that therefore there was as much argument in one case as in the other. With respect to the appointment of an additional member of the Executive Council, he would call the attention of the House to clause 134 of the Confederation Act, which did not in any way limit the restricted number to the first Council only.

Mr. McKELLAR said he remembered that when this question was brought before the House some two years ago, the hon. leader of the Opposition, some two years ago, strongly opposed the measure, and he did so again now.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON—I only did what the Crown officers of England had done without reproach, and with approval.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said that if a wrong had been done there that was no reason why it should be done here. He thought it was high time something was done in the matter. He would vote for it with all his heart, and had no doubt but that it would be carried by a large majority. A person holding the paltry office of Coroner could not take a place in the House, but yet the hon. member for South Grey could come here and still hold his trusteeship.

Mr. LAUDER said it was true that the hon. Commissioner of Public Works had told the people of Grey that he (Mr. Lauder) was bound hand and foot to the late Administration, and was afraid to oppose them; but the people did not believe that statement. Now that appointment which he held he had not sought. He had supported the late Government as steadily in the first two sessions of the late Parliament as he had in the third after he had received that appointment; it was not a question of support in return for bribery at all. There was not a man in the House who could say that he had voted in a different manner after receiving that trusteeship from the way he had voted before. He could tell hon. gentlemen that if they kept the Administration as free from corruption as the late Government did, they would do well. He believed the people of the country would condemn the action of

The Daily Telegraph.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, JAN. 31.

SECOND PARLIAMENT—FIRST SESSION.

TUESDAY, JAN. 30, 1872.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 2:15.

PEITITIONS.

The following were presented:—

Mr. HODGINS—From the Township Council of Bartie, for certain amendments to the Registry Act.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN—From James Coyle Brown and others, of Peterborough, that the Department of Education may be directed to furnish maps, &c., to certain schools.

Mr. DAWSON—From the County Council of the county of Kent, for an appropriation to dredge the River Thames.

Also—From the town of Chatham, for an appropriation to dredge the mouth of the River Thames.

Mr. WILSON—From the County Council of Elgin, praying that the Act before the House for the relief of the bondholders of the London and Port Stanley Railway may not pass.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Hamilton)—From the Public School Board of the city of Toronto, for the passing of an Act to extend the powers given to Public School Boards in relation to Industrial Schools.

Mr. CALVIN—From Schuler Shibley and others, that the Department of Education may be directed to furnish maps, &c., to certain schools.

Mr. MACKENZIE—From M. McInnes and others, of West Williams, that no Act may pass to separate the County of Middlesex.

Also—From John Dingham and others, of East Williams, to the same effect.

Also—From James Cuddy and others, of East Williams, to the same effect.

Also from A. Seabrook and others, of Delaware, that the Township of Delaware may be attached to the East riding of the County of Middlesex.

Mr. ARDAGH—From the Township Council of King, that the Bill for the construction of a railway from Hamilton to Hogs Bay may pass.

Also—From the Town Council of Barrie, to the same effect.

Mr. BARBER—From the Town Council of Milton, that the Bill for the construction of a railway from Hamilton to Hogs Bay may pass.

Also—From the County Council of Halton, to the same effect.

Mr. McDONALD (Leeds)—From Richard Preston and others, of Leeds, that the Department of Education may be directed to furnish maps, &c., to certain schools.

Mr. CARLING—From the Sandwich and Gavel Road Company, that the Bill now before the House for the construction of a street railway from Sandwich to Windsor do not pass.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES.

Mr. RYKERT presented the sixth report of the Committee on Standing Orders.—Received.

Mr. PARDEE presented the third report of the Committee on Private Bills.—Received.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were introduced, read first time, and referred to Private Bill Committee.

Mr. BETHUNE—To empower the Law Society of Ontario to admit James Fleming to practise as an Attorney and Barrister.

Mr. MONTEITH—To enable the Council of the Township of Lobo to repeal certain by-laws.

Mr. ARDAGH—To enable the corporation of Orillia to dispose of certain lands.

Also—To amend the Act respecting the Georgian Bay Lumber Company.

Also—To incorporate the Parry Sound Lumber Company.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Hamilton) To incorporate the Canada Petroleum and Railway Company.

Also—To incorporate the Pacific Junction Railway Company of Canada.