

part of political propagandists through the country, and had left their duties in the hands of their deputies. Still he had no doubt that they each and all religiously drew their salaries for the whole time. The hon. gentleman went on to condemn the means by which the present Government had accomplished their accession to the Treasury benches, charging them with having sprung a vote of amendment to the Address upon the House when one tenth of the country was unrepresented. He had been unable to discover any sound constitutional objection against Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's scheme for the distribution of money in aid of railways, and its terms had been deliberately framed, submitted to the House, and agreed to by it. He accused the Government of using the railway funds as a large bribe to the country. When they got into the Treasury benches they had abandoned their first scheme, had proposed to do a great deal more than they promised at first, and had even mortgaged the revenues of the Province to carry out their railway policy. They claimed credit for their conduct in reference to these grants, but he was convinced that the country would yet say that the trick by which they obtained power was a dishonest and a dastardly one. His course would be to support measures of true reform no matter who brought them in. (Cheers.)

Mr. FRASER expressed his inability to make out where the hon. member was standing politically; of course, he could understand where he was standing practically, but where he was standing politically was a matter to be found out. He had been described by the member on his right, who called him not only a Reformer, but that he had always been a Reformer. As the hon. member knew the hon. member for South Simcoe so well, he should be able to say where his political status should be placed; and he had placed it in the Reform ranks too. In a speech which was reported in the organ of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman showed how much he thought of those around him. It would be advisable to let the Reform members see what the hon. member had been saying in regard to his intention to occupy a seat in the Treasury benches. The report of the speech referred to appeared in the *Mail* of January 11th last. In this speech the hon. member is reported to have said that if he occupied a seat in the House he would not move a vote of want of confidence in the Mowat Administration, for he did not believe sufficient justification could be given. They must not only be prepared to justify a vote given to dispose of the Government of the day, but must send men of ability to fill their places in office; and he also remarked that the Opposition had not conducted business as it should have been. He (Mr. Fraser) thought that the member for East Toronto must feel complimented by that remark, and it is a very little compliment to those who now sit around him. Before he was through he would tell him what his friends thought of him, for it was just as well to know what the hon. gentleman thinks of those around him and also to know what they think of him. (Hear.) The hon. gentleman has boasted of having been member of the Administration since 1863, and claimed certain privileges belonging thereto. He also claimed to be a follower of Sir John A. Macdonald. In a pamphlet which was a reply to one published by the hon. gentleman shortly after his return from the Northwest, after referring at some length to the conduct of the hon. gentleman, he said "that his talents may secure him admission to the ranks of the Opposition in the House, but those who study the insurrection of the Red River will place very little reliance on his 'judgment.'" That is the character given to the hon. gentleman by those who knew him thoroughly well, on sending him out into the political world; and the House is, therefore, perfectly justified in accepting their estimate of the hon. gentleman. He might go further if the hon. gentleman so wished it. The hon. gentleman had had so many wanderings that nothing would hurt him now. He was somewhat surprised that the hon. gentleman should have referred to no partyism. He had endeavoured to gain capital with the cry of no partyism, but he was forced to tell the people of South Simcoe that he had been a Conservative since 1867 (laughter), and he believed the hon. gentleman had placed his following of the Conservative party as far back as Confederation. Before the hon. gentleman went to South Simcoe he was a

pronounced Independent while contesting the seat for East York, and in the North York election contest he was supported by a gentleman who, by his votes and the paper he published, was a supporter of this Government. The hon. gentleman had been preaching "no partyism" until the elections were all over. In his speech congratulating the member for West Toronto the hon. gentleman did not say anything about "no partyism," but he stated that his great object was that of getting the Conservative party into power in the Local House so that Sir John A. Macdonald could get in power at Ottawa. Here he was preaching that there was nothing but municipal matters coming up, and, therefore, there ought to be no partyism. But, *in vino veritas*—when the hon. gentleman was congratulating the member for West Toronto, they find him giving utterances to the desire to obtain power here with the expectation of the Conservative party obtaining power at Ottawa. Everywhere where he thought he could delude honest Reformers with his trash, there he preached no partyism, but in West Toronto he congratulated his friends on the possibility of the chance of their party getting into power in Ontario and Ottawa. The hon. gentleman was now what he had always been—a practical politician, one who was prepared to give advice if seated on the Treasury Benches, and when in Opposition he endeavoured to rally his friends around him with the cry of "no partyism," and give any advice which he might think would probably lead to success. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not like this record, but it was the truth. He made the record and must abide by it. (Hear.) If things appeared inconsistent he had himself to blame. In alluding to the abolition of the Court of Chancery the hon. gentleman speaks of what was done in England, but he (Mr. Fraser) did not understand it in the sense as implied by the hon. gentleman. He understood that in England they had abolished all the Courts, and had only one system of judicature. In referring to the assertion of the hon. member for East Toronto that the late Conservative Government had recommended the payment of criminal witnesses, he said that although it was true the subject was referred to in the Speech from the Throne, the Government of the hon. gentleman opposite had not a single line of the proposed measure prepared. The hon. gentleman forgot that his friends had been in power for twenty years, and did nothing to remedy the evil he complained of. The hon. gentleman had accused him of going down to South Victoria for the purpose of arousing religious animosity, and yet when he (Mr. Fraser) went there he found the hon. member, and the supporters of his candidature, had circulated an address to the Catholics asking them to support their candidate because the Reform party in Ontario were nothing but bigots. The hon. gentleman talked in this way about arousing religious animosity, when the paste of the green bill recently posted about Toronto was scarcely dry.

Mr. CAMERON—It was done by your friends.

Mr. FRASER said it was not done by his friends. They were not likely to commit suicide in that way.

Mr. LAUDER.—How do you know it?

Mr. FRASER said he knew it in the same way as the honourable gentleman knew it. In reply to the charge made by the member for East Toronto, that the title of the Lieut.-Governor had been changed from His Excellency to His Honour, he said it had been done at the request of the Lieutenant-Governor himself. The Opposition had nothing else to do but to indulge in this sort of petty cavilling. The hon. member for South Simcoe made a strong point about fixing the date for the assembling of the House. As that gentleman had had so much to do with the Confederation Act, why did he not make it a part of the Constitution of the Province that Parliament should assemble at some particular time? There was, however, in his opinion, no necessity for the measure. He thought that in discussing these questions a little more of the spirit of fair play should be manifested. The members of the Government could not be expected to do more than conduct the business of the Province to the best of their ability. If they administered affairs honestly, and put on record a greater amount of sound legislation than their predecessors, they could expect to be supported certainly during this Parliament, if not for many Parliaments to come. (Hear,