

to the House, for the desire he had expressed, and for his action in sending a cheque to the Treasurer. They held themselves responsible for the estimates which the Lieut.-Governor had recommended to the House, and when His Honour recommended that those estimates should be reduced they held themselves responsible for that recommendation. There was not a single word which had been commended here as the word of the Lieutenant-Governor that they did not take the full responsibility for either as advising it or as accepting it as if they had advised it. A suggestion might come from the Lieut.-Governor to the Ministers, if they did not act upon it there was an end of the matter, but if they did act upon it, they must take the responsibility for it. The usage was that the name of the Lieut.-Governor might be used without any formal written communication, as his recommendation might be made verbally, so long as the Ministry assumed the responsibility. The question of whether the Lieut.-Governor's communication should be entered on the minutes was another matter, but he quite agreed with the Speaker's ruling that it should not be entered on the journals of the House. If there had been a resolution dealing with a matter which they could not deal with unless it was recommended by the Lieut.-Governor, then there must be an entry upon the journals, for the communication in that case was the foundation of their action. He held that the amendment was perfectly in order.

Mr. MEREDITH said the whole point of difference was that here was a private communication from the Lieutenant-Governor, in a private capacity, and an official communication, proceeding in a constitutional way, upon the advice of his Ministers. A clear evidence of the private nature of the communication was the fact that it did not appear on the journals of the House, and its effect was to influence the House in deciding whether they should absolve the Ministers from personal responsibility in the expenditure of an unauthorized application of the public money. He contended that the motion of the hon. member for North York was out of order.

Mr. HARDY said that the hon. member in his statement had entirely left out the fact that an official communication might be made either verbally or in writing. The Estimates were recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor, and the same power might recommend a decrease. The Government, in speaking, spoke in the name of the Lieutenant-Governor. The letter was communicated by the Governor for the official use of the Minister of the Crown, and therefore it was public to the extent that the Minister made use of it within the scope of the letter.

Mr. FRASER said it was for the House to decide by its vote whether the expression contained in the resolution was true or not. He repudiated the question raised on a point of order. It was for the House to decide as to the truth of the statements.

Mr. LAUDER said that in every case when an official communication was made to the House it appeared on the journals. He had expected that when the Speaker was called upon to give his ruling on a previous evening that he would have said that no wish of the Lieut.-Governor could be expressed in a resolution of the House in an official form.

Mr. SPEAKER said that from the previous tone of the debate the objection taken by the hon. member for East Toronto was not entirely unexpected by him, and that he had given full consideration to the points now raised. He had previously declared the communication from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, and read to the House by the Treasurer, as of an informal and unofficial character. But any difficulties which might have been suggested to his mind by this fact were entirely removed by the declaration just made by the Premier, that full responsibility for the communication made to the House was assumed by the Government, and that it must be therefore regarded as made upon their advice. Under such circumstances, the objection raised by the hon. member for East Toronto fell to the ground. May, in describing the several modes of com-

munication between the head of the Government and the House, says that they are regarded as constitutional declarations of the Crown, suggested by the advice of its responsible Ministers, by whom they are announced to Parliament, in compliance with established usage, and they cannot be misconstrued into any interference with the proceedings of Parliament. In view of the declaration of the hon. the Attorney-General that the Government assumed the responsibility of His Honour's communication, he regarded the amendment of the member for North York as in order.

Mr. CREIGHTON regretted that the name of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor had necessarily been brought into this discussion through the cowardly action of his responsible Ministers. (Cries of "Order.")

Mr. SPEAKER ruled the language out of order.

Mr. CREIGHTON, continuing, argued that the trip was an indefensible one from every point of view. It was not of any benefit to the country. If it was an official trip, there were too many gentlemen connected with it who were not officially connected with the country. It was a holiday excursion trip which the country should not be called upon to pay for.

Mr. SINCLAIR regretted the flippant manner in which some of the hon. gentlemen had spoken. It was unfortunate that the name of the Lieutenant-Governor had been dragged into public notice in this connection, and nothing less could have been expected of him as a gentleman of spirit, when he found some of this expenditure called in question by the Conservative press and individuals through the country, than he should at once signify his desire to relieve the Province of the expense of paying for those items. From the public position he occupied it devolved upon him to exercise hospitality to a large degree, and it was not for the House to say that it should always be conducted on strictly temperance principles. He referred to the *Chicora* trip, in which he took part, and read from reports in the public press of the day to show the manner in which the party entertained and were entertained. He charged the Government of that time with having charged part of the *Chicora* expenditure to colonization roads. He justified the trip on the ground of public interest.

Mr. BRODER would support the resolution.

Mr. HAY desired before referring to the question, whether or not the expedition was in the public interest, to briefly refer to his own connection with it. He had left home with a friend to spend a week or so in the Manitoulin Island district, and happening to be on the same train with the Lieutenant-Governor's party he received an invitation to join them. He at first hesitated, not because he thought the expedition was not a proper one, but on account of private business interfering, but after consultation with his friends he finally consented to accept the invitation. Up to the time when the party arrived at Thunder Bay he had borne his own expenses. Before leaving home he had not the slightest idea of such a trip being in contemplation, and only heard of it when he met the party on the train between Toronto and Collingwood. The object the Government had in view in making this trip was to see that new country which they had obtained under the award, and as a matter of policy it was desirable that it should be seen. It was necessary that the Government headed by the Executive should obtain some idea of the mineral and agricultural resources of the country with a view to any policy of settlement that might be adopted by them. Taking a deep interest, as he had always done, in the settlement of the country, he felt justified in accepting the invitation he had received, and the objects of the trip were of such great public interest as to fully warrant the expenditure. He had no hesitation in saying that under the exceptional circumstances the trip was more justifiable than other trips which had been referred to during the debate. There were other reasons which would justify the trip. The