

Mr. HINCKS—As far as he was concerned the statement was perfectly false.

Mr. ROLPH—As far as was concerned they were perfectly untrue.

Mr. BROWN, Well they were a most extraordinary ministry, there was not one of them who had been repeatedly understood by their own friends, and the Postmaster General never had a speech properly reported yet; but he cares not whether the statements in these papers were true or not. Either they were, and ministers had broken their promises, or they were not, and then by putting such statements forth, or causing others to do so, they had wilfully deceived their constituents; but for such statements now declared false, the member for Norfolk well knew he never would have been elected. Now as to the fulfilment of their promises, though the late ministry had been broken up by the clamour of the members now representing Huron and Norfolk, because they would not secularize the Reserves by bill, the present ministry had not advanced one step farther than they, that was to say beyond the address to Her Majesty. Nor had they shown any desire to accomplish it in other ways. If they had, would they not have dealt with the 350,000 acres, what he had last session shewn, had been improperly reserved, and which they had in their own hands to deal with as they pleased. Another plank in the platform was no separate schools, and on this point, far from making any reform, they had actually carried the separate school system farther than it was before. Returning to the Reserves, he expressed an opinion that the application of the Canadian ministry to Lord Stanley's Government for power to legislate, was made in the expectation that it would be rejected, and that the news of its being granted deeply chagrined the hon. gentlemen opposite. At any rate when they had not the power asked for, it must have been at least expected that they would legislate at once, in accordance with their promises. How often had they said that the very peace of the country depended on the settlement of the very question which now that it was in their own hands they postponed. As to this postponement, it was clear from the statement of Mr. Sicutte, that, but for the secret being forced from them, the country would have known nothing of it till Parliament next.

Mr. Sicutte here stated the circumstances of this affair much the same as he had done on Friday evening.

Mr. HINCKS remarked that what was desired was that Mr. Sicutte should assume the responsibility of taking office before he communicated with his constituents. He himself desired to see if he could be elected before he took office, there was no precedent for anything so extraordinary. Had he accepted office he might have gone to his constituents and told them the truth at once.

Mr. Sicutte, the facts were not as now stated by the Inspector General. The request to be allowed to explain his position to his constituents was fully refused, and he must censure the hon. gentleman for using his name in connection with statements which were not in accordance with what took place, the question of his acceptance of office was not put at all, the answer was that the ministry must have time to prepare before making known their plans.

Mr. SHAWWOOD said that if Mr. Sicutte had desired leave to consult his constituents before taking office, it was not so unprecedented as the Inspector General said. In Sir Charles Bagot's time, when Mr. Hincks was first Inspector General, he Mr. Sherwood had accepted office on the express

written condition that he should be allowed to consult his constituents in a public meeting or otherwise. This was assented to. A meeting was held; resolutions passed approving of his acceptance of office, and he took his seat beside the Inspector General in the Executive Council.

Mr. BROWN cared nothing for the understanding between these two gentlemen, what he wished to impress on the house was that the gentleman was desired to go to his constituents and allow them to elect him on pledges, which he knew he could not fulfil.

Mr. HINCKS on the contrary he had expressly stated on Friday evening that the gentleman if he went back to his constituents must be elected free of all pledges.

Mr. Sicutte made some remark which did not reach us.

Mr. BROWN—At any rate the organs of the ministry were for months after proclaiming that immediate secularization was to have taken place. He had himself first directed attention to the change in the ministerial mentions in the *Globe* last October, when his statement was at once declared to be one of the false stories of the member of Kent, and that idea was propagated by the whole ministerial press for weeks after, till the *Pilot* was authorized to state the fact. Even when the announcement was felt to be so damaging, that letters were at once written by the members for Norfolk, Oxford, and Huron, and published throughout the country to counteract the effect. The hon. member for Norfolk now said that the whole cause of the postponement was the extension of popular liberty; but that hon. gentleman should remember that three reasons had been given—this constitutional one by himself; the Governor General, by Mr. Cameron, at Perth, and the alleged fact put forward by Mr. Hincks, that Lower Canada had not been consulted on the subject. As to the last objection, he would ask whether the ministry had not constantly maintained that Lower Canada was with them on this point? As to the speech at Perth, though he denied it, it had been well shown by the member for Simcoe that his explanation was quite absurd. Nor was that speech the only manner in which the statements it contained had been put forward. The hon. member for Norfolk had in his letter said that the Governor General would consent to legislation, in the present position of things—that if they had insisted "the ministry must have resigned," and that then "the Tories would have come in." He believed that there was not a man in the House who did not believe this to be the true reason; but was it right for a constitutional ministry to take such ground? Here was the hon. member for Huron telling fifty people at Perth what was the opinion of the Governor General—that was the idea that gentleman entertained of his position! Such conduct was most damaging to the reputation of the Governor, and ministers must have none that would be so. But to return to the reason given by the hon. member for Norfolk, he asked if that was the real reason why it was not found out before ministers went to Upper Canada. But had not the hon. member heard this very reason confuted by the hon. Inspector General. Surely the statement of the latter gentleman that the house was incompetent, was not a mere trick—surely so great a constitutional authority as the former would not have allowed his colleague to make such a statement without the authority of the cabinet, and yet that gentleman came there and tried to amuse the house with talk about moral obligations,

public liberties, &c. He and his colleagues had kept the whole thing snug in their own power till within twenty-four hours when the law compelled them to assemble Parliament, and then turned round and said, Oh, how gladly would we secularize, but the constitution will not admit us. Yet with this difficulty of the constitution staring them in the face, these same gentlemen had passed a franchise law, not to come into operation till 1855. How happened the Cabinet to be constitutional, if the Parliament were not. They professed to derive their power from the House, and yet they performed all the functions of a constitutional ministry, while they talked of the unconstitutionality of the house by whose will they sat. They could issue millions of money to a humbug company of their own, and yet could come down and say it is quite constitutional to legislate on this or that measure because we give you leave, but anything the country needs will be quite unconstitutional. The hon. member proceeded to comment on Dr. Rolph's speech of yesterday. He was perfectly horrified at the manner in which the hon. member had attempted to garble extracts from the "Examiner," and "Globe," and that was the only way he could express himself at such conduct. He was prepared for much but certainly never had expected that. The hon. member attempted to read the "Globe" to make it prove the very reverse to what it did really. The article condemned the government for postponing the secularization of the Reserves, yet the hon. member wanted to make the "Globe" say that postponement would increase the chances of secularization. The real argument of the "Globe" was that although voluntaries might be on the increase in Upper Canada, the government wanted to make the question of secularization cover their own jobbing and corruption, and to say to the people that they could not have secularization unless the were content to take it in connection with the ministry and their misdeeds. The government delayed the appeal to the people and yet would not proceed to legislation. That was an injury to the country. He understood that there were three bills before the House to increase banking facilities, which the business of the country very much needed, and which were needed to aid in the development of the resources of the country. Yet such things were of no importance to hon. gentlemen opposite provided they could only be kept in power—do that and the interest of the country may be sent adrift. He would next examine the platform and the promises of the parties who made the present ministry in Upper Canada, and on the strength of which they obtained power. Had the representations of the platform makers not been made to the people of Upper Canada, gentlemen opposite could never have obtained power. Yet how had they been kept? Almost every one of them had been falsified. Here the hon. member read over the items of the platform and dwelt on them in detail. First there were the factories, these they were pledged to abolish by bill. What was done? A humbug law suit got up against the Bishop of Toronto. Then came sectarian education. The platform makers promised non-sectarian schools; but the ministry gave an extension of sectarian schools. This he looked upon as the worst fault the government had committed in politics. He would rather give up all the Clergy Reserves to the Roman Catholics, or any other church, than have the youth of the country educated to sectarian differences. Then came