

And whereas it is the opinion of this Assembly that a prohibitory liquor law, such as prayed for by the said petitioners, would be most beneficial in its results to this Province.

And whereas it is desirable to bring the matter under the notice of His Excellency the Governor-General of the Dominion of Canada, and of the House of Parliament now at Ottawa assembled. Therefore,

Resolved, That memorials be prepared, setting forth the facts above stated, and respectfully praying that such legislation may be had as will carry out the wishes of the said Petitioners, and that one of the said memorials be addressed to His Excellency the Governor-General, and one to each of the Houses of Parliament of Canada now assembled.

That a Committee, consisting of the Hon. Messrs. Pardee and Wood, Messieurs Farewell, Calvin, Macdonald, Clarke (Norfolk), and the Mover, be appointed to prepare such memorials, and that the same, when so prepared, be forwarded in the proper manner for presentation. He said that some persons did not concur in the ruling of Mr. Speaker, that the disposal of this question was in the hands of this Legislature, although he himself thought the decision was a correct one. He was of opinion, however, that the least that could be done was to take the course pointed out in these resolutions.

Mr. McCALL supported the resolutions.

Mr. CAMERON said he had been charged by a reverend gentleman, whose cloth and profession should have prevented him from making any statement for which he had not good proof, with saying that the supporters of temperance were fanatics and hypocrites. This statement had been repeated by a temperance paper in this city. He denied that he had ever in any place used such language—what he had sometimes said was that the temperance advocates were sometimes intemperate in their zeal, and the statements made by this clergyman and this newspaper showed that this statement was not wrong. The paper referred to had also insinuated that he was not temperate in his own habits, and liked to see his friends drink. What his view on the subject was was this—that it was not right to interfere with the right of the people—that the minority should never be able to control the rights of the majority. He believed that not one person out of a hundred would drink to excess, and he did not see why the ninety-nine should have their liberty restrained for the sake of the one. He himself by his own personal example endeavoured to advance temperance, but he did not think it right to restrain the rights of any person. With reference to the charge that he was putting himself in opposition to the advocates of temperance, he said that he would be either a fool or an idiot to declare against such a large body. He did not see why this House should be called upon to interfere in this matter at all. The persons who petitioned this House could just as easily petition the House of Commons, who had control of the matter.

Attorney-General MOWAT said he saw no substantial difficulty in the way of the House adopting the resolutions or sending the House of Commons an address on the subject. It was a mere matter of discretion whether this Legislature should memorialise the Government at Ottawa in this or any other matter. The Government here had no objection to the address passing. (Hear, hear.)

The resolutions were then passed.

THE TILBURY LOTS.

The adjourned debate on the proposed address in reference to certain lots in Tilbury East was resumed by

Mr. CAMERON, who said that the order had been on the paper since the 24th of Feb., but it had not been taken up until he was absent from his seat, when a foul attack had been made upon him. He was prepared to go on with his defence now, but he trusted that the gentleman who had assailed him would move for a committee of enquiry into the matter, which would be composed of political opponents of his (Mr. Cameron's) own, and if he had an enemy in the House he hoped that person would be put upon it. He hoped also that the Commissioner of Crown Lands would adopt the same course when he came to make his explanations about the Elgin frauds. In reference to the statement made by the member for Stormont, that Mr. Stephenson got the land on the understanding that he should abuse the Commissioner of Public Works, the absurdity of such a charge was patent, when the fact was that Mr. Stephenson got the lots before a word was said in the press in regard to what were known as the Elgin frauds; and when the facts of the case were stated it would be acknowledged by every candid man that Mr. Stephenson received but scant justice in the

matter. He (the speaker) did not over-rule the decision of his predecessor in office, Mr. Richards. In the year 1853 Mr. Eli Stephenson, the father of Mr. Rufus Stephenson, bought three lots of land in Tilbury—14 and 16 in the 9th concession, and 5 in the 5th. By an Order in Council, passed previous to Confederation, it was provided that any person who had paid instalments upon several lots was at liberty to apply them all on one or more and get his patent therefor. In 1865, Mr. Stephenson made application to that effect, and had his payments on these lots in Tilbury consolidated and applied to the purchase money of another lot or lots, for which he obtained the patent. This was said to have extinguished his right of pre-emption to the Tilbury lots, although a balance remained to his credit in the Department. Mr. Richards took that view of the case when applied to by Mr. Stephenson to consummate his original purchase at the original price. In the meantime a man named Clancey had been cutting white oak timber off these lots; the timber was seized, and realized more than the original price of the lots. When he (the speaker) became Commissioner of Crown Lands, Mr. Stephenson asked him to be allowed to consummate his original bargain, and he (the speaker) told him he was prepared to re-sell him those lots, with the arrears of interest, at the original price, the value of the lots having necessarily been depreciated by the loss of the timber. There was no right given to Mr. Stephenson to realise from the sale of the timber, as would have been if the original sale had been held to have continued valid. Instead, therefore, of there having been a job in connection with that transaction, Mr. Stephenson was hardly dealt with when he was not allowed to get the price of the timber sold. Mr. Stephenson brought evidence to the Department to show that he was not aware that the timber had been cut. The speaker here read several letters and affidavits from Messrs. McKellar, Russell, Clancey and others, to show that

Mr. Stephenson was not aware of the fact that timber had been taken off these lots. The whole transaction was a simple one, and the statement that there had been a corrupt bargain that Mr. Stephenson should slander the Commissioner of Public Works for bringing to light the cutting of the timber, was without foundation. He asked for a Committee of Enquiry into the matter, and that should be the course adopted by any member of the Government or other public servant charged with giving favours that he should not give. He believed that he and his colleagues, when in power, had done the best they could in the interest of the country; they had not supported their supporters in the sense that hon. gentlemen appeared to do sometimes. The member for Stormont seemed to have taken the Commissioner of Public Works under his special care, and had embraced the opportunity simply of declaring that that hon. gentleman was not guilty of the charges against him. He (the speaker) had not come to anything like a conclusion that the Commissioner had done any wrong, but the evidence should be submitted to a Committee of Enquiry such as he himself asked for.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said that the hon. gentleman who had just addressed the House would have it that he had come to no conclusion in regard to the Elgin frauds, but at the same time, if the evidence were not placed in a certain way, he would not be satisfied he said, and the action that gentleman had taken to-night would convince any unbiassed mind that he had come to a conclusion. He had not made any charge against the member for East Toronto, and he had no objection to that gentleman criticizing his conduct. In regard to the affidavits read to the House, there was a letter from one of Mr. Stephenson's own witnesses advising him when the timber was cut, and that party got a letter from Mr. Stephenson acknowledging its receipt. There was evidence to show that Norris & Neelon had paid money for the timber. No cash had been paid the Department; the officials said, by Mr. Stephenson, as that gentleman had stated; and when all the papers were down the member for East Toronto might come to the conclusion that he had been misled in the matter.

Mr. CAMERON—I hope you will move for a Committee of Enquiry.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR—You can do so yourself. I have stated facts that I am prepared to prove at any time.

Mr. RYKERT said that the member for Stormont the other day had made charges against the member for East Toronto which he had afterwards retracted; and now the Commissioner of Public Works said he brought no charges against that gentleman, but at the same time he had listened apparently with satisfaction to his mouthpiece