

that the Opposition should be fairly represented. The engagements he had to make apart from those which devolved upon him as a legislator, deterred him from giving as much attention to the public accounts as ought to be given to them. Mr. Merrick would be a great acquisition to that Committee, and he (Mr. Cameron) desired this addition should be made to the Committee. He did not think the hon. gentleman could raise any objection to Mr. Merrick's name being put upon the Committee.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said that the hon. member gave as one of his reasons why this motion should be granted was that he himself was unable to attend the Committee as closely as he desired. The Government had no objection to Mr. Merrick's name being substituted for that of the hon. member for Toronto East. It was not expedient that this matter should be re-opened. The composition of the Committee had already been discussed by the Committee struck for the purpose of nominating the various Committees. The conclusion came to was reported to and adopted by the House. The hon. gentleman said those who were interest-

ed in ascertaining that the public money had been properly used should be more largely represented in the Committee. Why, they were all interested in that. There was not a single member of the Committee who was not interested in proper expenditure. Hon. gentlemen opposite had as large a representation on the Committee as they had in the House. The most active men in figures which the Opposition possessed had been placed upon the Committee, and, as he had said before, if the hon. leader of the Opposition desired to have Mr. Merrick's name substituted for his own, the Government would not oppose the alteration. He, however, could not see why there should be any change made in the Committee, and the Government would oppose the change proposed.

The members were then called in and the following division took place:—

YEAS—Ardagh, Boulton, Bolton, Calvin, Cameron, Clemens, Code, Corby, Currie, Deacon, Deroche, Fitzsimmons, Gibson, Gifford, Giles, Grange, Guest, Hamilton, Hodgins, Lauder, McCall, McManus, McRae, Meredith, Monk, Oliver, Read, Richards, Rykert, Scott, Springer—31.

NAYS—Barber, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Caldwell, Chisholm, Christie, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Craig (Glengarry), Crooks, Crosby, Farewell, Finlayson, Fraser, Gow, Haney, McKellar, McLeod, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Fardee, Paxton, Prince, Robinson, Sexton, Sinclair, Smith, Smettinger, Striker, Watterworth, Webb, Williams (Hamilton), Wilson, Wood—36.

GOVERNMENT PATRONAGE.

Mr. ARDAGH moved for copies of all letters received by the Commissioner of Public Works and replies thereto; and of all papers filed in the Department of Public Works in reference to the removal of the bar at the mouth of River Wye, in the County of Simcoe. He complained that during the recent elections Mr. Cook had referred in North Simcoe to the influence he possessed with the Local Government. He had said it was through his influence that the bar at the mouth of the River Wye was to be removed, and that it was only when he solicited the Commissioner of Public Works that the engineer was sent down, and the necessary sum placed in the estimates. He had also asserted that he had letters in his possession which would bear him out in this statement. Mr. Cook had particularly pointed out that he, as a member of the Dominion Government, could do what he (Mr. Ardagh), backed up by the City Council, could not do. He (Mr. Ardagh) considered it necessary for the maintenance of his dignity that it should be known what position members like himself, sitting on the floor of that House, occupied.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said they had correspondence with both gentlemen. Mr. Cook, a member of the Dominion Government, had urged this matter on them. This Government did not choose to adopt the doctrine that nothing should be done for a county that was not represented by a supporter of the Government. This policy was enunciated and carried out by the former Administration. The policy of the present Government was to expend the public money judiciously upon those portions of the country which required it most. Mr. Cook had repeatedly urged the matter upon the Government, and it was generally known that a Government gave more attention to its friends than opponents. This improvement, however, would be undertaken purely upon its own merits.

Mr. LAUDER proceeded to refer to a case which he considered an analogous one, and which would corroborate the statement made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, in which documents had been given by the Local Government to aid Dominion candi-

dates.

The SPEAKER, however, ruled the observations and comparison of the hon gentleman out of order.

Mr. M. C. CAMERON repudiated the doctrine which had been attributed to the late Administration, and claimed that it had been governed by the utility and necessity of the works. The Commissioner of Public Works, however, had acknowledged that their policy was the exclusion from Government favours of counties not represented by supporters of the Government. Their disreputable tricks would come up in judgment against them at the proper time.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR maintained that the hon. member for East Toronto had mistaken his remarks. Their policy was to carry out the public improvements as the public interest demanded.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said the leader of the Opposition had chosen to misunderstand and misstate what his hon. friend the Commissioner of Public Works had said on this subject. They all knew very well that when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, their doctrine was that nothing should be given to a constituency unless it sent representatives to support the Government. This was not a mere assertion; it was proclaimed at all great public gatherings. Axe-grinding was one of the avowed principles of the leader of the late Administration. He (Mr. Mowat) maintained that when improvements were asked for they yielded to the demand in any meritorious case, when they were satisfied they could defend before the whole country the grant for that purpose. In no case had they made improvements in the constituency of a supporter rather than in the constituency of an opponent. Had the hon. Commissioner of Public Works made the statement the hon. member for East Toronto attributed to him he would have made an incorrect statement. The Government found out where money should be expended and expended it accordingly. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BOULTBEE desired information as to whether the Government intended to be governed by members of the Dominion Parliament rather than members of the House. He proceeded to refer to the late election in East Peterboro', at which he asserted the Provincial Secretary and the Commissioner of Public Works represented to poor people in that riding that it would be to their advantage to return a member who would support the Reform Government, which was allied with the Ontario Government. Now, this action he (Mr. Boulton) maintained was wrong, and the principle was pregnant with evil. The Public Works questions which came up were questions of utility, and it should not be necessary, as it appeared it was, for constituencies to elect a supporter of the Government before they could get justice done them.

Mr. PAXTON deprecated the taking up of the time of the House by such trifling questions. He then went on to speak of a previous debate, when

Mr. LAUDER called him to order.

The SPEAKER ruled the hon. gentleman out of order in referring to a previous debate.

Hon. Mr. FRASER denied that he had ever employed the argument at East Peterboro' which had been imputed to him. Nothing had fallen from his lips which by any torturing could be so construed. The hon. gentleman had no authority for making the statement, and must have drawn upon his imagination for it. He was never present at any of the meetings, and could not even name any individual who said that either himself or colleague ever made use of such an expression. He (Mr. Fraser) remembered a certain institution which was located in a certain locality, because the members from that part were sent to support the late Administration.

Mr. M. C. CAMERON said that the institution at Belleville was located there because it was the most suitable place. Its representatives supporting the Government was no reason why that location should not be chosen.

Hon. Mr. FRASER was not any better satisfied with that explanation. The hon. gentleman could not deny that the leader of the former Government told a constituency that if they had an axe to grind they had better send it along with a man who would support the Government.

Mr. LAUDER rose to a point of order. The subject before the House was the river Wye, and not the making of appointments.

Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. gentleman was quite in order in answering the charge.