

\$800, salary of official secretary, be struck out, and that the item of \$900 contingencies be reduced to \$500.

Mr. MEREDITH in speaking to the amendment, referred to the recent trip of the Lieut.-Governor to the North-West. Speaking of the expenditure incurred on the trip, he argued that the Lieut.-Governor should not have been asked to pay any portion of it. The whole outlay was improper, and the Government was responsible, because His Honour had no control over it in any way. He had every respect for the office of Lieutenant-Governor, but he had yet to learn that it was not the duty and the place of the House to criticise any of the details of public expenditure. An attempt had been made to justify the affair by reference to the expenditure which occurred on board the *Chicora*. Whether such expenditure was justifiable or not it afforded no justification for the action of the Government in the present instance. He apprehended there was no parallel between the two trips. The previous trip was undertaken after due notice had been given, and it was joined in by members of both sides of the House. He denied altogether the attempt to make the issue on the \$350. The ground taken by the Opposition was that the whole trip was unnecessary, and for the purpose of obtaining the sense of the House he moved the following amendment to the amendment:—
“That the following words be added to the proposed amendment:—‘And this House, while prepared to assent to all reasonable appropriations for this service, does not approve of the practice of expending the public moneys of the Province for the purposes for which the sum of \$5,456 23, a part of the item of \$5,571 23 appearing in the Public Accounts under Expenses re visit of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to the North-West, &c., was expended, and is of opinion that the expenditure of the said sum without the authority of this House for the purposes for which and in the circumstances under which such sum was expended was unwarranted and unjustifiable.’”

Mr. MOWAT said that official visits to different parts of the country are desired by the people, and he thought they were conducive of a great amount of good. The visit of the Lieutenant-Governor to the North-West has had the effect of bringing that country more under the notice of the people in this section. It was made on the occasion of one of the grandest events in the history of this Province. Our territory in the west and in the north had been disputed. The matter was referred to arbitrators, and this great extent of country was awarded to us. Whenever any great building was opened there was generally a demonstration of some kind, and he thought it befitted this great event for the Lieutenant-Governor to make an official visit to the new territory. When this trip was made it was publicly made known beforehand through the press, and there was nothing said about it being an extravagant thing. The hon. members opposite, notwithstanding what they may say to the contrary, knew that the trip was to be made. Not a word was spoken or written against it, as they recognized the propriety of such a trip, and he could see no other earthly reason for their now opposing it than that they wanted to make a little political capital out of the affair. No doubt they thought that a matter of a few hundred dollars would create an unfavourable impression against the Government, but he never thought that his hon. friends opposite would ever stoop so low as to try to make a little petty political capital out of a small matter of this kind. Complaint was made at the number of other gentlemen who accompanied the Lieutenant-Governor, but it was not to be supposed that he would go alone. There was nothing more fitted to call public attention to this great country than the official visit of the Lieutenant-Governor. Besides this there was also very important information got by the visit. The resolution before the House implied that it was a practice of the Government to get up these trips and pay for them, but he was sure the hon. gentleman opposite knew that it was not a general custom for the Government to do so. He would be greatly surprised to know if the people of this country objected to allow the Lieutenant-Governor to have an official visit. He was of the opinion that they were anxious for him to make such visits around the country. He was not meant for the capital alone and to be confined there, but he was meant for the whole Province, and it was his duty to visit all sections of the country under his charge. He thought there was no reason why the resolution should not be voted down, and he was sure the House would have no hesitation in doing so.

Mr. MORRIS said there was no doubt but that the trip had been of public advantage to a certain extent, but the House should be asked to give their opinion as to whether it was necessary for the Lieutenant-Governor to visit this country with a few private friends, and also to ascertain whether the Government was justified in making this appropriation without the sanction of the House. Was it of public advantage for the party to ride down certain rivers in canoes, and ride along Government railways? He did not think so. Neither did he think it was of public advantage for the party to be composed of what could not be called representative men. If the Premier and Minister of Public Works had gone on this trip, and stated their reasons for going, there would not have been a word said about it; but as His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and Provincial Treasurer were the only representative men out of the whole thirteen, he would ask if the Government was justified in paying the expenses of the other eleven, who could not be said to be representative men. The party anyway had only gone through a portion of this great country. They went to Winnipeg and to St. Paul, and from there to Chicago, and then came back to Toronto, so that quite a portion of their time was spent in the United States. He would ask whether there was any such grave or important occasion that this visit should be made at such a time, and whether there was any reason why this particular party should have been chosen to travel at the public expense. He fully concurred with the resolution before the House, whether it referred to the *Chicora* trip or this one.

Mr. METCALFE spoke in favour of the resolution.

Mr. FERRIS contended that it was in the interest of the country that this trip should be made, and he thought the Government was justified in making the grant. He repudiated the statement that as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee

he had refused to allow a member of the press to have access to the papers in reference to the Lieutenant-Governor's trip. He had occasion to mention the matter in Committee, and to say that it was improper that a paper should be taken off the table and handed surreptitiously to a reporter. He always held the position that all the members of the press should have access to the papers.

Mr. AWREY said the Opposition had not attempted to prove that the expenditure was without precedent, but they opposed it simply on the ground that certain items were charged for luxuries, and under that guise they had attempted to make political capital out of it. The proper light in which to view the expedition was on the broad question whether or not it was in the interest of the country. He defended the outlay and pointed out that the people of Ontario were watching the North-West country with interest, in the belief that it was well worth striving for.

Mr. ROSEVEAR believed that the Attorney-General himself did not quite sanction this outlay. He charged the Government with having sought to screen themselves behind the backs of the Conservative party. Reference had been made to the actions of the Conservatives, but they should remember that the Conservatives did not claim to be strictly honest—(laughter)—while the Reformers always had clean hands.

Mr. WATERS pointed out that it was not shown that under the Sandfield Macdonald Administration the Government came down to the House asking for an appropriation for such a purpose. The Government might have taken the course which the Opposition say they should have taken, but they had this precedent in the case of the *Chicora* trip. The Lieutenant-Governor had shown himself to be a gentleman of spirit in wishing to remove these objectionable items from the public charge, and after that was done it was not for any member of the House to question it in any way whatever.

The amendment to the amendment was lost on a division—Nays, 53; Yeas, 27.

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Baskerville, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Creighton, French, Harkin, Kerr, Lauder, Lees, Long, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Monk, Morgan, Morris, Near, Parkhill, Richardson, Robertson (Hastings), Rosevear, Tooley, White, Wigle—27.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Awrey, Badgerow, Balfantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Bonfield, Caldwell, Cascaden, Chisholm, Crooks, Deroche, Dryden, Ferris, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Huron), Gibson (Hamilton), Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Hawley, Hay, Hunter, Livingston, Lyon, McCraney, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mack, Miller, Mowat, Nairn, Neelon, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Peck, Robinson (Cardwell), Robinson (Kent), Robertson (Halton), Ross, Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Waters, Watterworth, Widdifield, Wood, Young—53.

In the debate on the amendment,

Mr. ROSS said that the question had been exhaustively discussed in the House, and he did not propose to speak at any great length on it. He thought that the trip was justifiable on account of the newly-acquired territory in the North-West. Not a question would have been raised about this trip if it had not been for the open and straightforward manner in which the accounts were laid before the Public Accounts Committee, instead of, as on a former occasion, being smuggled through as belonging to colonization roads. The object of the Opposition was to make a little political capital out of the matter, and that was the reason they made such a fuss about it. He had a resolution to submit to the House, which was as follows:—
“That all after the word ‘that’ be struck out and the following substituted: ‘That while concurring in the resolution, this House, recognising the immense importance of the territory recently awarded to Ontario by the Boundary Arbitrators, and the unpatriotic and hostile attempts in some quarters to prevent the ratification of that award, desires to express the opinion that the recent official visit of the Lieutenant-Governor to this newly acquired territory, being an assertion of the jurisdiction of the Province over the same, was judicious and proper; that while this House fully approves of the visit and recognizes that the expenditure connected therewith charged to the Province has been but in accordance with the invariable custom of such official visits heretofore, as, for instance, the trips taken by the late Sandfield Macdonald Government, notably the one in the *Chicora* in 1868, desires to express the opinion that expenditures for spirituous liquors in connection with any such official trips or visits should not hereafter be charged to the Province.’”

The resolution was carried without discussion on the following division.

YEAS.—Messrs. Appleby, Awrey, Badgerow, Balfantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Bonfield, Caldwell, Cascaden, Crooks, Deroche, Dryden, Ferris, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Huron), Gibson (Hamilton), Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Hawley, Hay, Hunter, Livingston, Lyon, McCraney, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mack, Miller, Mowat, Nairn, Neelon, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Peck, Robinson (Cardwell), Robinson (Kent), Robertson (Halton), Ross, Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Waters, Watterworth, Widdifield, Wood, Young—52.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baker, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Creighton, French, Harkin, Kerr, Lauder, Lees, Long, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Monk, Morgan, Morris, Near, Parkhill, Richardson, Robertson (Hastings), Rosevear, Tooley, Wigle—25.

The item was then concurred in.

The House adjourned at 12 o'clock.

CORRECTION.

In the report of the debate on motion to go into Committee of Supply, in THE GLOBE of Friday, the statement that Mr. Broder expressed himself as “in support of the resolution” was incorrect. In his speech he declared himself in opposition to the amendment of the member for North York.