

on his side more of the hon. gentleman's co-religionists than could be numbered on the side of the Government, and no coercion was employed to obtain their support, but it was merely represented to them that they could not claim greater rights or privileges than other classes of their fellow-subjects. He was surprised, finding that his Honour had visited various institutions in the Province, that no allusion had been made to a work which the Government had taken credit for as being a great benefit, he alluded to the Inebriate Asylum at Hamilton. The House knew nothing about this building, whether it was finished, or whether it would be diverted from its original purpose. The House had been told that insanity was on the increase in this Province, and, nevertheless, an institution formerly used as an asylum for the insane at Orillia had been allowed to go to rack and ruin when it might have been utilised by hon. gentlemen towards relieving the jails of unfortunate lunatics. It might have been expected, too, that some allusion would be made to the Central Prison in consequence of the failure of the Canada Car Company to carry out their contract, and stating what arrangements had been made to utilise the undertaking. The House knew that \$430,000 had been sunk in it, and yet it was not considered worth a passing allusion. Nothing better, perhaps, could be expected from a Government who seemed to have adopted a policy of inactivity. They claimed that there was nothing for them to do, but unfortunately they could not point to anything they had done which had tended to make the country more prosperous. Everything they had done had been initiated by their predecessors. The few measures they had passed in regard to the amendment of the law had caused considerable difficulty. He recollected that a late distinguished ornament of the Government—Mr. McKellar—used to complain when the House was called together so early as the 8th of November, because it interfered with his fall ploughing. Now they had three Courts sitting and transacting business long before this Parliament was called, and both counsel and clients were inconvenienced. When the law was amended so as to make the Courts sit during Term, a step was made in the right direction. It so happened that three different Assize Courts were sitting during Term, and it was impossible for counsel engaged to attend at all at the same time. The Government had also bungled in the election law. It was now said that some of its provisions were absurd, that they required amendment, and it was suggested that the Government should introduce a Bill for the purpose of removing disqualifications which had fallen upon some through the courts of justice. The Government would have to be very careful that they did not make the proposed law apply to those who had been found guilty of corrupt practices. He could understand that if a gentleman was disqualified because he took a glass of beer with the President of a Reform Association—an association opposed to him in politics—his disqualification should be removed. In many other respects the Government election law had been faulty, and it was now found to be impossible to determine whether the voters' lists of 1874 or 1875 would be the proper ones to use, owing to the bungling way in which the provisions of the Act were expressed. The Government were responsible, as they framed the Act. So obscure was its meaning that several lawyers—members of the House—held different interpretations. He had been told that the Attorney-General had expressed an opinion adverse to what was declared the intention of the Act on the floor of the House. The present was the occasion usually adopted by gentlemen on the Treasury benches to give a review of what they had done during the recess. Unless this was done the House might be deprived of a full opportunity of getting an idea of what had been done. If Opposition made enquiries when the estimates were being discussed, they were told that they must ask only for particulars of the amounts to be voted, and were referred to the Committee on Public Accounts. On going to the Committee of Public Accounts they were told they must ask for a Special Committee. He then proceeded to compliment the mover and seconder of the Address on the manner in which they had discharged the duty entrusted to them, but thought that the hon. member for North York had not shown such independence as his assurance to his constituents might have led one to expect. The views

of the hon. member for Northumberland, he thought, conflicted with those of the Government, and it would be shown, perhaps, that the Opposition was stronger than was anticipated by the Government.

The paragraph passed.

Paragraphs two to five passed without discussion.

On the sixth paragraph,

Mr. MACDOUGALL wished for information as to the number of immigrants and the amount of money expended. Something of that kind was necessary. He had no desire to offer any obstruction to the passage of the Address, but he thought that some general statement should be given as to the amount of money expended on immigration and the amount of contribution paid to that "gigantic" establishment in London.

Mr. MOWAT informed the hon. gentleman that he would find all the information he asked for in the estimates as to how much is paid to the London agency.

Mr. MACDOUGALL—How much is it?

Mr. MOWAT.—\$5,500. All is set forth as the honourable gentleman desires.

Mr. MACDOUGALL.—But this is a new House.

Mr. MOWAT hoped that this new House would know what the old House had done. He would be sorry if members had not possessed themselves of some information with regard to public affairs. But he might say, for the general information of the honourable member, that the amount expended on immigration had been less in 1874 than it was in 1873, and it has been considerably less in 1875 than it was in 1874, and it is proposed that there shall be a further diminution in the expenditure this year in consequence of the new arrangement made, which rendered the same expenditure unnecessary. This was, he presumed, all the honourable member desired now, but he would have the whole matter in detail by Monday or Tuesday next.

Mr. HAY said he desired to refer to a few questions mentioned in the Address. It was no reason for affording aid to railways that municipalities had invested their money in them. If any aid was to be granted to railways in the older sections it should be on condition that the enterprises were of great public importance, and that they were certain to be completed. The railway policy of the Government heretofore had been such as to recommend it to the country. (Hear, hear.) Railways should be the pioneers of colonization instead of the followers, and he hoped the Government would energetically promote railway enterprises into new sections of the country. He described the northern portion of the country in glowing terms, and contended that only a progressive railway policy would prevent our people from going to the Western States and the North west. The railway question was the most important which the House could consider, and yet the member for East Toronto called the Speech which contained a reference to it, mere. He approved of the new immigration system, which would save a large amount of money to the country, and had brought in the right class of immigrants. He was glad the laws were to be consolidated, as every simplification of the law was in the interest of the people. He deprecated the introduction of personalities in debate, and claimed independence for himself and others who still owed a certain allegiance to their party leaders. (Cheers.)

Mr. CLARK (Norfolk) expressed his hearty consent at the position taken by the Lieutenant Governor in his speech, and he congratulated the Government on the entire absence of any reference being made to party. He considered the Government should be in advance of public wants and public opinion; but he regretted that in this instance, as regards the care of insane people, the Government had followed public opinion. Referring to the large number of petitions which had been sent down to the House on the matter of intemperance, he regretted no allusion was made in the Address to the evils of intemperance. The Speech was congratulatory on many matters, but to this important question of intemperance no reference was made. Crime was on the increase in the country, and intemperance was also largely on the increase, and he contended that they wanted to have statistics showing the number of deaths caused by intemperance and the poverty arising from the use of intoxicating drinks placed before them before they would be brought to their senses.