

the Government in creating anew office in the way they had done before they had even taken their seats or given a vote at all. If this policy was correct, who knew but perhaps he had another office ready to be filled. If one new office could be created, then any number of new offices could be created, and then the hon. President of the Council would say that it was only necessary to live up to the spirit of the law, and not to the letter. The Government seemed to think it necessary to pass this Bill to keep themselves from falling into corrupt practices; but if they left as good a record as the late Government they would do well.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS said if the Bill was intended to apply to hon. gentlemen at present in the House, he should oppose it.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE stated that he did not know that any hon. member held such an office with emolument attached to it.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS explained the circumstances under which the hon. member for South Grey had been appointed to a trusteeship. It was the merest trumpery to introduce a measure of this kind to prevent a Government from appointing to a paltry office of that kind; however, in order to remove all such grounds of complaint, he was willing to vote in favor of it. The latter part, referring to the appointment of a sixth member of the Council, he should oppose, his opinion being the same as formerly.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that if the hon. member for South Grey still held an appointment, with emolument attached to it, the Government would consider whether a special exemption should not be made.

Mr. LAUDER explained that he still held the trusteeship referred to. The company at their

annual meeting board had moved a resolution to the effect that a sum of money should be set apart as a gift to the trustees. He had had nothing to do with the division of the money, but it had been divided by the Hon. M. McMurrich. He still held the office, and was not ashamed to own it, and had been elected twice since having taken it.

Mr. HODGINS thought the hon. member for South Grey was not quite correct, as there had been a certain sum of money set apart as an item in the annual report for the remuneration of the trustees.

Mr. LAUDER said that he was not present at the meeting, but he had the Hon. Mr. McMurrich as his authority, whose veracity he thought would not be doubted.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said that there was another gentleman on the Opposition side of the House who had been talked of as leader, and he had lately been making himself conspicuous in the debates on this question. The hon. gentleman's insinuations would have no effect in dividing the great Reform party. Hon. gentlemen opposite might act in accordance with the instructions they received from Ottawa but they would produce no effect on the Government; he (Mr. Mackenzie) knew all about their little game. The custom of the British Government in making appointments had been referred to as an example, but the circumstances were different. With regard to the appointment which had been referred to, he said that the hon. gentlemen who received those appointments had been expected to vote against the then Government, but after receiving those appointments became supporters of it.

Mr. LAUDER distinctly denied that he, as one of the parties referred to, had ever acted with the late Opposition before he received that appointment.

Mr. MACKENZIE maintained that in accordance with British Parliamentary practice the hon. member for South Grey had no right to vote on this Bill. In reference to the appointment of an additional member of the Council, he said that since the Reform Act of 1832 there were a number of instances of Ministers without portfolios being appointed in the British Cabinet. He thought the debate had been of a satisfactory nature.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that several allusions had been made to the 3rd clause, which appeared to have been misunderstood; all that that clause provided for was the requirement of re-election of a member of the Executive Council without portfolio. With respect to the reference which had been made to the 13th clause of the Confederation Act, he (Mr. Blake) as a lawyer, was perfectly satisfied that the interpretation which he gave to that clause was correct. He had not the slightest doubt in regard to the sections of law regarding his new office, for he had anticipated the change in the Government, and had thought about these clauses for months before he was called upon to advise upon them. The practice of the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government had been referred to by the hon. member for South Grey; but since that time the law had been changed, and it was no longer legal for Crown council to be employed in such business. He thought the Government had reason to be gratified at being able to bring forward this measure so early.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS said he thought the bill was a step in the right direction, and should therefore support it.

The SPEAKER then put the motion that the Bill be read a second time; and declared the motion carried. But hon. members on the Ministerial side insisting on a division being taken, the members were called in and preparations made for a division. However, as there appeared to be no opposition to the Bill, the Speaker ruled that the yeas and nays could not be taken.

The House then, on motion of Mr. Blake, adjourned at eleven o'clock.

#### Notices of Motions.

Hon. Attorney-General Crooks—On Thursday—Bill intitled: An Act respecting the Law Society of Ontario.

Mr. Ardagh—On Thursday—Address for a return of all the surveyed lands in the County of Simcoe belonging to this Province, the fee of which is still in the Crown, showing the township, town or village, number and concession of each lot, or part lot.

Also—Stating in respect to each lot, or part lot, the following particulars:—If sold, or agreed to be sold, the deed in such case, the name of the purchaser or intending purchaser, the date or sale, or agreement for sale, the price for which sold, the amount paid thereon, and the amount remaining due at date of return. Also, the conditions of payment in cases of sale, and as to settlement, or otherwise, (if any.) Also, the fact of any lot, or part of lot, being occupied or improved within the knowledge of the Crown Lands Department, and the time when such improvement made or such occupancy commenced, so far as known. Also, if any timber license granted for any lot or part lot, and if so, the date and terms of such license.