

always believed that the readiness with which leading Reformers consented to join the Coalition fully attests the fact that their vote was not of the very serious character attributed to it by Mr. Penny. As for the statement at foot of page 5, that Confederation was "invented" at that time to rally parties round the same flag, it is well known, and the author even admits, that it was broached by Mr. Galt and his colleagues years before, and if it became a matter of joint policy in 1864, we may fairly consider it due, as we stated before, in a great measure to the deliberations of the Brown Constitutional Committee.

It is by no means an established fact that "England hates coalitions." And we can scarcely see why ours should in any case be called an "immoral combination." Statesmen in all countries have, from time to time, coalesced for moral objects, and we fail to observe anything seriously immoral in the preparation of an elaborate form of Federal Union for these Provinces. Ministers have announced and explained their reasons for declining to submit the scheme to a popular vote, and, on the whole, their arguments have convinced us that, had the plan been tested by a popular vote, while it would undoubtedly have been carried, thereby saving much of the present opposition to the scheme; still, the difficulties of settling or amending details at the hustings would have retarded a Union at a critical juncture in our political condition. The dangers of a *plebiscitum* in the preparation of a constitution, were amply, and we think satisfactorily exposed, by Hon. Mr. McGee at the Cartier banquet within a few months.

That the Coalition was "a personal bargain to give some colour of public spirit to Confederation," and that it was "*invented*" to seal this pretended "personal bargain," we fairly and squarely deny; and the conduct of the Reformers in the Cabinet during last session, and of their large majority of supporters, even under the pressure of Mr. Brown's attacks, furnishes a guarantee that they acted in perfect good faith in carrying out the special object for which the Coalition was originally formed.

As to the casual introduction of the Postal Subsidy question and Sectarian grants to the Churches of Rome and England—we really cannot appreciate their importance in this argument. In all deliberative bodies, when

the ruling party is supported by a powerful majority, different interests must be conciliated; and however much the Reformers of Canada may feel scandalized at the allowance of an equitable postal subsidy to our Railways by His Excellency in Council, or the grant of a few hundred dollars to a deserving University, the present Government have in that respect merely followed the usual custom, or the numerous examples given by their predecessors in office.

The Commissioners appointed in December 1864, to enquire into the payments to be made for postal service by Railway, offer the following opinion in their able report to His Excellency, dated 29th March, 1865.

"That the power reserved to Your Excellency in Council to fix the rates to be paid for Railway Postal Service, is a *quasi-judicial* power, and should be exercised accordingly, "is so clear in itself, and has been so explicitly declared by Your Excellency in Council, and "by successive Ministers of the Crown, that it "does not seem to the Commissioners to be now "open to discussion."

This power has thus been exercised by Lord Monck from time to time, and as it is "*a quasi-judicial power*," we fancy that no very grave crime has been committed. In the case alluded to by the author—the matter was, we are informed, thoroughly sifted by a Committee of the Executive Council, and the postal subsidy was re-arranged to meet an equitable demand of the Company. The discussion in Parliament with regard to certain special sectarian grants, resulted, as the author must recollect, in the thorough justification of the Government in placing the amounts in the estimates.

The Buffalo and Lake Huron Amalgamation Bill can surely not be quoted as a party question. The House was very evenly divided on several occasions, and if some few members had been induced by sound reasoning during the recess to change their votes, how can Mr. Penny lay the blame at the door of the Coalition? We cannot believe that he is serious in considering the vote on that Bill as one for which the Government can be accused of wrong-doing. In fact he admits that "the divisions on this Bill were not absolutely "identical with the lines of political parties." If so, why in all seriousness include them in his Bill of Indictment? The last reproach of that character, is, that the present Government re-appointed Messrs. Delisle, Brehaut,