

He did not believe in the necessity for an agricultural college. Theoretical farming would not suit this country.

Mr. BOULTER argued that the present Government was a coalition. He did not intend to offer any factious opposition, but would support every measure he thought beneficial to the country.

Mr. FAREWELL said on behalf of himself and some of those who sat round him that they approved of the *personnel* of the Government and of the programme they offered, and, as they hoped to get away in the spring, they were not going to take up time by talking, but would wait till the actual work of the session commenced.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that there were very few who would believe that the case of the Treasurer was not one which the law required should be brought before the people, he having changed his office, and he quoted sec. 7 of the B. N. A. Act to support that view. He claimed that there was no constitutional difference between this case and the double shuffle. Two of the most distinguished members of the old Government had retired, another chief was selected, and he advised his Excellency to take in three of the colleagues of the old leader, and one new member. The new member had to go back for re-election, but because, it was said, these gentlemen had not changed office, they need not be so re-elected. But had not a new Administration been formed? After deprecating the action taken last session in the disposal of Crown timber lands, he observed that it had been stated by the hon. member for Brant that experience been shown in the past that judges in England had come from the Bench to take part in the administration of public affairs. There was no doubt but that was the case, but many things that had happened in England in times past would now, if repeated, be considered against the Constitution and public interest. Amongst these things was the transferring of judges from the Bench to political positions. He instanced the undertaking by Judge Morrison of a political commission, the performance of a political service to the country, for which he was strongly censured. The action of the Attorney-General was excused by some on the ground that it would never be done again. He (Mr. Cameron) maintained that it was a matter of principle which should not be violated. He thought the example was none the less wrong because no one was likely to follow it. It was undesirable, because there were times when the necessities of Government might be so great that they might in order to get rid of a troublesome supporter place him on the Bench with a prospect of his remaining there, and receiving the emoluments of that office, returning to office again the minute there was an office ready for him. In fact, the Bench might be used as a resting place until there was an opening for him in political life again. There were also other considerations to which he had before alluded, and it was not in any spirit except of patriotism that he opposed the action of the hon. gentleman in this. There was no analogy between the present case and that of Judge Morris, because that gentleman occupied a judicial position and was not mixing in politics. In reference to the proposition to build new Normal Schools, he would not oppose them, but he must first be convinced that the great expense was necessary. He thought it would rather be better to pay the expenses of would-be teachers to Toronto than incur so great an expenditure. He would object to the schools being built in Kingston and Ottawa, if merely for the sake of verifying the telegram of the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and because the member for Kingston deserted the Government he was elected to support.

Atty.-Gen. MOWAT said that if the hon. member for Kingston was elected to support the hon. gentleman opposite it was certainly something entirely different from his whole political life. He (Mr. M.) remembered once having an election in Kingston when the hon. member was one of the leading Reformers who met him. On another occasion he had had the honour of being carried on the shoulders of two of the leading Reformers of Kingston, and his hon. friend had done him the honour of being one of them. The hon. member for East Toronto would find when the Government came down with their propositions as to the Normal Schools that they would be able to present reasons for so doing which would be supported by the country. The hon. gentleman had himself, he believed, advocated placing a public building in a locality in which the members supported the Government. He would find also that there was a kind of authority for the establishment of these schools, to

which he would be inclined to allow a good deal of weight. The hon. gentleman had poken again with relation to his (Mr. Mowat's) position in the House, but he had not added much to the argument he had used before. He had spoken of the evil of his taking part in parties. If there was any evil, if there was anything to be feared from this example it was that a judge might be influenced by hopes of advantage from one of the political parties. If that was the danger it was quite apparent that it was equally great in the case of a judge who is appointed Lieut.-Governor. Almost all the judges in the land might be said to be influenced if that principle were carried out, for did not puisne Judges look forward to Chief Justiceship and Vice-Chancellors to be Chancellors. He then went on to explain how in England the field of promotion open to judges was much wider, and that there, although advancements were always given to judges by the leaders of their own party, no evil effects were found to follow the party-feeling which of necessity they must feel.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said a Judge might come into the Government, increase the salaries of the Judges, and then go up again to the Bench.

Atty.-Gen. MOWAT—I assure my hon. friend I have no intention of doing so. (Laughter.)

Mr. CAMERON—I am sorry to hear it.

Attorney-General MOWAT would be glad to see the Judges' salaries increased, but did not think this was the right House to do it.

Mr. RYKERT—They were increased here, and you took the thousand dollars.

Attorney-General MOWAT — And didn't I deserve it? (Applause and laughter.) He had not said it was wrong. It was certainly a stretch of the power of this Parliament. Allusion had been made to the case of Chief Justice Draper, and it was said that it was in the interest of the country that he went to England on his mission. Was it not also in the interest of the country that he the (Attorney-General) had come to this House? (Hear, hear.) He believed the majority of the people of the country thought so. The objection taken to Judge Draper's mission was that it was a political one. At that time the country was divided into two antagonistic parties. The Opposition favoured the obtaining possession of the Hudson's Bay territory, while the Government was acting without that determination in the matter which it was urged they should have shown. Judge Draper went to England merely to watch the proceedings for the Government. He (Attorney-General) was sorry to have to discuss this case, and did not wish to do so unnecessarily. Before his entrance upon the Bench he had not been acquainted with that learned and distinguished gentleman, more than any other professional gentleman was, and he then respected him highly. After his association with him his opinion had become much exalted and he held him in the very highest esteem. He (the Attorney-General) then referred to the case of Justice Morrison, and contended that the objection to his remaining without a seat was the length of time during which he did so. The hon. member for East Toronto had discovered since yesterday some new light on the subject of the position of the Hon. Treasurer. In his (the Attorney-General's) view nothing could be more plain than that the construction the hon. gentleman placed upon the statute was entirely wrong. In fact, the hon. gentleman had not resigned formally any further than that his resignation followed, of course, upon the resignation of his leader, which resignation, as all knew, was worthless when not accepted. The constitutional law on the subject required that it was not only necessary that the Administration should have resigned, but that the different office should have been filled again in the meantime before a re-election was necessary. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. RYKART referred to the circumstance of the Attorney-General accepting a position from a person who had no authority to bestow it, and for accepting \$1,000 from a person who had no right to give it. Reference had been made to the Nova Scotia subsidy, and they were censured because they gave Nova Scotia their due, while Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Blake had proposed that \$60,000 to \$70,000 should be given to that Province in addition to the subsidy granted by the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. WOOD denied that Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Blake had made any such motion, and explained the action taken by Mr. Mackenzie in the matter. There was one obser-