

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

THE HOUSE ADJOURNS AS A MARK OF RESPECT TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE MR. H. E. CLARKE.

TORONTO, March 28, 1892.

The Legislative Assembly sat for only a few minutes this afternoon and then adjourned out of respect to the memory of the late Mr. H. E. Clarke, one of the members for Toronto. Mr. Mowat and Mr. Meredith made brief but sympathetic addresses expressive of the loss sustained by the death of their colleague. The former was much affected, his agitation several times interrupting the course of his remarks.

Mr. Mowat spoke as follows:—

The funeral of our late fellow-member, Mr. H. E. Clarke, has been appointed for half-past 3 to-day, and I therefore move that, without proceeding with the business for the day, the House do now adjourn as a mark of respect to the memory of our late fellow-member. The suddenness and circumstance of his death made it one of very special solemnity to us all. He had been a sufferer from heart disease for some years, and the trouble had been gradually increasing as he himself was aware, and as we probably all had perceived. When he addressed the House on Friday, the day of his death, his voice was as strong and clear as it had ever been, and his mental vigor seemed the same. But in the middle of a sentence he stopped, sat down, and in a few moments he ceased to live. In view of the circumstance, it is satisfactory to remember that nothing whatever had occurred in the chamber on that day to create any excitement or to bring about in any degree the sad end. Not very much of a stormy kind has taken place this session, and on Friday there was happily absolute freedom from excitement and everything unpleasant. Nothing of a party kind had come up, and the discussions had been of the calmest description. The subject on which Mr. Clarke began to speak was one of municipal taxation, and he was expressing his opinion with characteristic mildness of manner and language when the sad event occurred. Honorable gentlemen of his own party in the House saw more of him and knew him better than we on this side had opportunity of doing; but we saw and knew enough of him to obtain for him our respect and our esteem also. One could not see or know him at all without being aware of his exceptionally genial nature. We knew him also to be a man of integrity--which is more important. He was a pronounced party man, and was so appreciated by his party that he held the place of the leader's lieutenant in this House, and acted as deputy leader in the absence of his chief. As a party man, he necessarily took opposite views to ours on most debatable questions; but we never doubted that he did so conscientiously, and that he was a man who loved the right, and supported only what he thought to be the right. At the same time he liked to be on good terms with everybody, so far as he conscientiously could; and his disposition evidently was to avoid expressing himself towards any of his political opponents in a way to give to any of them unnecessary offence. Thus his personal friends were many, and, so far as I know, he had no personal enemies. He was a fluent speaker, had a pleasant voice and his observations always showed thoughtfulness and reading and common sense. All this we on this side give him credit for, even when differing most from the opinions he expressed. His successor may be a more brilliant man, or a noisier; but the electors and the House will be fortunate if he is as good a man and as useful a member. He died after a lifetime of success in business and otherwise. He died at his post as a representative of the people. He died in the very act of discharging public duty. He died regretted by family, friends and all who knew him. He died without pain, and yet he died forewarned; and he died prepared. Who could desire for himself a better ending of a life that must end sometime and somehow?