

Mr. Matheson's Criticisms.

Mr. Matheson said that for the first time in this House the admission had been heard that the Government was proposing direct taxation. The Minister of Education not only admitted it, but he undertook to defend the principle of direct taxation in Provincial matters. The attempt had been made to show that it was not direct taxation unless the collector was sent around to each municipality. Evidently then it was not direct taxation to take money from widows and orphans and scatter it right along, not for the benefit of the people of the Province, but in the interest of the party on the other side of the House and their friends. It had been represented that the banks and insurance companies and other institutions were satisfied with the tax, but Mr. Matheson read a protest signed by the Managers of life insurance companies in Toronto protesting against the taxation on life insurance companies as unfair. Mr. Matheson went on to attack items in the supplementary estimates relating to Bracebridge court house, the London Normal College, and the reformatory in Woodstock as being bribes to constituencies.

He added that they had institution after institution added to those in existence, which were either absolutely unnecessary or beyond the means of the Province to keep up without imposing additional taxation. Two of these institutions were the new reformatory in Oxford County and the Normal School at London.

Mr. Marter read an extract from a speech delivered by the Treasurer in 1869 to the effect that the permanent sources of revenue at that time gave an annual income of \$2,000,000, a sum sufficient to meet the wants for government and enable them to vote grants to public works and institutions. Since

then the revenues had largely increased, and should have been sufficient with ordinary care to meet all demands. The Government estimated a deficit of something over two hundred thousand dollars, but claimed a cash balance of six hundred thousand dollars. That being the case, why should they bring down these bills? Referring particularly to the license revenue bill, he said that while desirous of encouraging anything that would aid the cause of temperance he did not believe that they had the right to harass those engaged in the liquor traffic so long as it was the policy of the Government to grant them licenses to carry on their business. The city authorities of London and Kingston, for instance, were bitterly opposed to the measure, and he did not understand how their representatives in the Legislature could vote on the measure for mere party's sake.

The amendment was declared lost on the same division and the bill passed its third reading.

Ottawa Sunday Cars.

On the motion for the third reading of Mr. Lumsden's City of Ottawa bill Hon. Mr. Gibson proposed an amendment which, he said, would give the city power to authorize street cars running on Sunday, notwithstanding the interpretation of the Lord's Day act, but would not remove this authority from

annulment by the Legislature in the future, should that be deemed desirable.

Mr. Carscallen thought that in view of this proposal the Government should state its policy on the question of running street cars on Sunday.

Mr. Crawford thought the measure was contrary to principles laid down by the present and the preceding Administrations. It was the only instance of its kind in the Province.

Mr. Conmee said that the same thing existed in regard to the street car service in Toronto.

Mr. Crawford said that if such was the case he would withdraw his opposition.

Mr. Stratton thought the bill, having previously passed committee of the House, should go through.

The bill was then read a third time.

Bribery Charged.

On the motion to again go into committee of supply Mr. Whitney moved in amendment the following resolution: "This House strongly disapproves of the practice indulged in by Ministers of the Crown of encouraging the electors in constituencies to believe that they will receive material favors and advantages from the Government, provided they return supporters of the Government to this House." Speaking in support of the resolution, Mr. Whitney said he thought the proposition embodied in the proposed amendment would commend itself to all thinking people who had the welfare of the country at heart. There was grave and serious danger in the course pursued by some Ministers of the Crown during the general and bye-elections. They had gone before the people and had told them it would be better for them, so far as their material interests were concerned, if they returned a supporter of the Government. He quoted from a report in *The Globe* of a speech delivered by the Attorney-General during the elections to support his charge against that gentleman. He also quoted from a speech delivered by Hon. Mr. Ross at Madoc during the North Hastings campaign, and which he said was a most bare-faced, bald attempt to bribe the electors of that constituency.

Premier Sets Mr. Whitney Right.

Hon. Mr. Hardy said the Opposition leader had placed an improper construction upon his (the Premier's) speech. He had quoted something as a statement of fact which had no foundation. It might, however, be applied with perfect truth to the party in power at Ottawa a few years ago, of which Mr. Whitney was an illustrious member—(Opposition cries of "Oh, oh")—to every speech made by every Conservative leader upon every platform in this country upon which he spoke. It was promised to every manufacturer in Canada that if they voted to keep the Conservative Government in power they would give them a protective tariff which would increase the value of their products and put money in their pockets. Yet Mr. Whitney pretended to have so sensitive a stomach that he could not even stand an allusion to the fact that you could send to the Legislature a supporter of the Government instead of a supporter of the Opposition. Mr. Whitney should have read the pertinent and important part of the speech—the part with which