

such circumstances, and with feelings overwrought and highly excited, Mr. Mathieson preached a sermon that touched on the event. The sermon was printed at the request of the congregation, but it is noteworthy chiefly as the first literary milestone in Dr. Mathieson's career.

#### CANADIAN PARLIAMENT.

In our last number we gave His Excellency's speech, with an account of the opening of the third Session of the first Parliament of the Dominion of Canada.

#### THE SENATE.

At the session of the Senate held on Wednesday the 16th inst., the business transacted consisted merely of the presentation of several petitions.

On Thursday, after the introduction of Mr. McLelan, called to the Chamber in the place of the late Hon. Mr. Weir, Hon. Mr. Benson moved the reply to the speech from the throne, seconded by Senator Dickey.

Friday 18th.—Senator Letellier de St. Just demanded explanations respecting the reconstruction of the Cabinet. Hon. Mr. Aikens and Senator McMaster gave the desired explanations. Hon. Mr. Benson thought it advisable for the Ministry to explain the basis upon which the Cabinet was constructed. The debate was continued until twenty minutes to four.

Monday 21st.—On motion of Hon. Mr. Mitchell the Act respecting the Coasting Trade of Canada, and the Bill respecting Distressed Mariners were read a second time.

Tuesday 22nd.—Hon. Mr. Campbell moved the appointment of the Standing Committees. Senator Letellier de St. Just complained of the inadequate accommodation for members of the Senate in the House of Commons. Hon. Mr. Campbell said the Government would endeavour to remedy the matter. Hon. Mr. Mitchell moved the second reading of the Bill respecting Fishing by Foreign Vessels. The House then went into committee and reported the Bill respecting the Relief of Distressed Mariners, and the Bill respecting Coasting Trade.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On Wednesday, the 16th inst., after the introduction of Mr. Pouliot, the new member for L'Islet, Hon. Mr. Holton called the attention of the House to the position of the late Commissioner of Public Works, Mr. McDougall, and suggested that the question affecting the hon. gentleman's seat be referred to the Committee on Elections. Sir John A. Macdonald recited the facts in connection with the appointment of Mr. McDougall as Governor of the North-West. He said that on the first impression it did not appear clear to him that the seat was vacant, but he thought it best for the present to avoid any strong expression of opinion on the point. He would be glad, however, to hear the opinions of other members on the constitutional law. The fact of no certificate of a vacancy having been issued to the Speaker, seemed to show that his impression was shared by other gentlemen in the House. Mr. Holton said that the appointment of Mr. McDougall had never been gazetted, and the course of sending certificates to the Speaker by two members could not be adopted. Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald thought it advisable that steps should be taken to lay the foundation for action, by moving for a writ. Mr. McKenzie deemed such precipitancy inadvisable. It would be better to postpone discussion until the papers relating to the subject should be brought down. Hon. Joseph Howe said the papers were ready and no time would be lost in bringing them down. Mr. McKenzie desired information as to the state of the Departmental Reports. Sir John said he would enquire into the matter and report to-morrow. Mr. McKenzie wished to know when the House would receive the Public Accounts. Sir Francis Hincks could not state the exact day, but every effort was being made to lay the Accounts before the House at the earliest possible date. Hon. Mr. Holton said that the Departmental Accounts were supposed to be closed at the end of June. It was now after the end of January and the Finance Minister was unable to say how soon they would be laid on the table. Sir Francis Hincks explained that he had met with great difficulty in this matter from the difference of the system in use in the Maritime Provinces to that adopted in the Upper Provinces. He was now engaged in an examination of the mode of getting up the Public Accounts. Sir John A. Macdonald gave notice of two Bills, respecting Elections and a Supreme Court. The consideration of the Address was postponed until the next day. Mr. A. G. Archibald, the new member for Colchester, was introduced.

Thursday, Feb. 17.—Mr. Savary, M. P. for Digby, N. S., rose to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the sentiments of which he very generally echoed. He said that although no promise had been made in the speech of any particular measure with reference to increased protection of the fisheries, yet he had reason to believe that the Government were disposed to take steps to protect this important branch of industry. With regard to the North-West, the trouble in the territory had been the result of misapprehension on the part of the inhabitants as to the intentions with which that country was sought to be acquired by Canada. He rejoiced at the assurance given by His Excellency that it was desirable to exhaust every means of conciliation before resorting to other measures. On the clause respecting Banking and Currency, he said he was in hopes of seeing a measure introduced to assimilate the currency of the different Provinces. A measure was also promised to regulate the coasting trade and the merchant shipping—a subject especially important to the people of the maritime Provinces. He spoke of the prosperity of shipping interests in Nova Scotia, which he attributed to the beneficent policy of the Dominion Government. He was anxious to see the census in 1871 taken, as he believed it would show a great increase in the population and wealth of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. He was struck with the marvellous progress made by the Province of Ontario, and which he thought could not be equalled within the last ten or fifteen years by any one of the United States. He also referred to the progress in Public Works. Mr. Scriver seconded the address. He endorsed the views of the Hon. mover respecting the assimilation of the currency. He desired the extension of the franchise, and expressed himself in favour of the elections being completed in one day. It was desirable to obtain a better market for our agriculturists, and he trusted that there would be a renewal of the commercial relations which formerly existed with the United States. Hon. Mr. Holton asked the leader of the Government for explanations in reference to the changes which had taken place since the prorogation in the composition of the Cabinet—changes which, he said, amounted

to a reconstruction of the Ministry. Sir John A. Macdonald objected to Mr. Holton's statement that there had been a change in the Government. The introduction of four gentlemen into the Cabinet did not affect the policy they had announced in 1867. As to the retirement of Mr. Rose, that gentleman had, after accepting the duties of Finance Minister, received a very advantageous offer from England, which, after consideration, he thought it his duty to decline. After the close of the last session of Parliament, the offer was renewed, and as there was then nothing to detain him, Mr. Rose, after consultation with Sir John, resolved to accept it. But at his (Sir John's) request, he was induced to remain a short time in office to carry out the work. As a member of the Privy Council, he took a share in their discussions, but carefully abstained from giving any expression of opinion on questions of a new policy. As to the question respecting negotiations said to have taken place between the Government and the member for Sherbrooke (Sir A. T. Galt) relating to the occupation of the office vacated by Mr. Rose, he said that an offer had been made at the suggestion of the Minister of Militia, and that the member for Sherbrooke had been pressed by the present Minister of Finance to accept the post. The member for Sherbrooke had not found it convenient to enter the Government, and he (Sir John) had accordingly sought the aid of the present Minister of Finance. It had been said that the Finance Minister had no habitation here when he took office; that he had left the country and was now a stranger. He contended that this was no objection to his friend's entering the Cabinet, as was proved by the case of Lord Elgin. That nobleman had left England early in life, had been in Canada and in India, and was as completely away from England as the Finance Minister had been from Canada, and yet that did not prevent him from taking office on his return. Mr. Holton objected that Lord Elgin had always been a member of Parliament. Sir John referred to the case of the member for Chateaugay, and said that all he contended for was that the Government that selected his Hon. friend showed a great deal of tact. He next took up the objection advanced to the composition of the Government by the introduction of four new members. He sketched the history of the Cabinet from the coalition in 1867 until the time when two vacancies were created by the death of Mr. Blair, and by the present member for Colchester losing his seat. These two vacancies were not filled till the present Lieut.-Governor of Ontario was appointed, and vacated the office of Minister of Inland Revenue, when negotiations were postponed till the return of the Minister of Militia and the member for North Lanark from England, when arrangements were entered into that the member for North Lanark should be Governor of the North-West, as soon as it should be united to Canada, and Aikens accepted office; and the Minister of Finance, who was in the country, was induced to enter the Government. With reference to the re-arrangement of the basis of parties in the Government, he explained that the result of the last elections had been the return of more Conservatives than Reformers; and he thought it not unfair that this increase of Conservative representatives should be considered in filling up the vacancies. As to Mr. Morris' acceptance of office, the Government would follow the general policy of 1867. Mr. Morris had done nothing since the union to incapacitate him from becoming a member of the Government. He would not say any more on that point, but his hon. friend would learn at the proper time what the policy of the Government on the question was. Mr. Jones, (Leeds and Grenville,) asked if the member for North Lanark did not resign his seat as Minister of Public Works when he went to the North-West; and how the present Minister of Public Works was appointed in his place. Sir John explained that Mr. McDougall's commission was to have and to hold the said office during the pleasure of the Sovereign. Her Majesty was pleased on the 8th of December, to exercise that pleasure. Mr. Jones (Leeds and Grenville,) asked if they were to understand then that the Minister of Public Works was dismissed, or did he resign? Sir John did not think the member for North Lanark was insulted by removing him from one office to confer upon him a higher office. Sir A. T. Galt announced the withdrawal of his support from the Government. He reviewed the position of the country, and stated his conviction that the administration of Sir John A. Macdonald had been a failure. He had come to the conclusion that Confederation had been retarded; and that the course taken by the Government was not the best to bring about that desirable end. He also disapproved of the policy of the Government with regard to the Intercolonial Railroad, and regretted the barren results of the negotiations with Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. The speech of the Governor General had been a serious disappointment to him; and the appointment of Finance Minister was, he considered, the most unfortunate that could have been made. He announced that though he united with the Opposition to bring about a change, yet there was no similarity between his views of policy and theirs. Mr. McKenzie condemned at great length the reconstruction of the Cabinet as destructive of the Reform balance of the Coalition. After recess Mr. McDougall entered into lengthy explanations respecting the reconstruction of the Cabinet, condemning the departure from maintaining the Reform balance in the Cabinet. Sir John A. Macdonald said that in 1867 the appeal to the country was made on no party cry, but they asked the support of all parties to unite on one grand basis. It was not a question of Conservatives and Reformers—they were called upon as Canadians to carry out Confederation. He denied that he had committed any breach of faith in altering the basis of the coalition, and read a letter from Mr. Howland in support of this view, and also a written statement of Mr. Aikens. Mr. Blake contended that there was a breach of faith in altering the basis of the coalition, but at the same time expressed his joy that the coalition was there publicly declared to be dissolved. Mr. Cartwright condemned the appointment of the Finance Minister. He announced his want of confidence in the Ministerial re-arrangement, but said that he would offer no factious opposition. Mr. Ferguson condemned any hasty opposition to the Government. The Government should have fair support to enable them to carry out Confederation. Sir Francis Hincks entered into explanations. He claimed to have been always a member of the Reform party. He deprecated all such puerile attacks on the Government, assailing neither their policy nor any proposed measure. The whole question in dispute was whether two or three Reform members occupied seats in the Cabinet. He stated that Sir A. T. Galt had supported his government in 1854 till within 36 hours of his resignation. Sir Alexander Galt denied that he had been a regular supporter of the Hincks Government. Mr. Bowell desired to support the Government whenever he could conscientiously do so; but he condemned the appointment of Sir Francis Hincks. Hon. Mr. Howe would answer the charges

and slanders referring to his department when the papers came down. Mr. Masson, of Terrebonne, condemned the paragraph in the Speech referring to the North-West. He contended that we had no right in that Territory, and should not threaten coercion.

Friday, Feb. 18th. After routine business Mr. McKenzie resumed the debate on the address. He blamed the Finance Minister for statements made in his circular respecting annexation agitations, and proceeded to attack the Government in relation to the change of base in the coalition. He censured Lieut-Governor Howland for aiding in the reconstruction of the Cabinet on the new basis, after receiving the offer of his present position, and went on to denounce the Government as having failed in every one of their undertakings. He next alluded to the charges made against him and his friends as disunionists and friends of "Howe the annexationist," and spoke of reports of expressions indulged in by the Secretary of State in reference to the North-West. While speaking of the North-West, he wished to know the date of the instructions given to Mr. McDougall. Sir John A. Macdonald said they were dated the 28th September. Mr. McKenzie blamed Mr. McDougall for not setting out immediately on his mission, and for not arriving at Red River before the outbreak of the insurrection. He blamed the Government for not carrying out the agreement with the Imperial Government and the Hudson's Bay Company. He next attacked the Government on the disorganization of the Finance Department, and concluded by defending his party from any blame or responsibility attachable to them for the ill success of the Government. Dr. Tupper denied the truth of the assertion made by the member for Lambton that the Government had failed in their undertakings. With regard to the North-West he had every hope of a speedy settlement of the difficulties in the Settlement. He attacked the member for Sherbrooke (Sir A. T. Galt) for his desertion of the Government on questions on which he had hitherto supported them; but at the same time he was glad that he had left the party, as his views on the Independence question would make him a source of weakness to any party. Mr. Huntington replied, condemning the policy of the Government in relation to the North-West. After recess, on the motion of Hon. J. S. Macdonald, the House adjourned to allow members to attend the Citizens' Ball to Prince Arthur.

Monday, Feb. 21.—Hon. Mr. Howe resumed the debate on the Address, explaining his conduct in the North-West and defending himself against the charges that had been made against him. Hon. Mr. McDougall contended that the conduct of the hon. gentleman at Winnipeg had done much harm to the cause of union. He trusted that the House would grant a committee to enquire into the matter. He maintained that the insurgents had been encouraged in the course they had taken by the belief that their action would be sanctioned by the hon. gentleman opposite. As for himself he had nothing to complain of of the Government as a whole, but he thought it was not such a government as was best fitted to deal with the question before the House. Hon. Mr. Howe replied that he was quite prepared to show how unjust these attacks upon him were. He denied that he had used any expression that might be construed into an instigation to insurrection, and stated that when they came to consider the question, it might be his duty to show to the House that the cause of the difficulties with which they had to contend was more or less attributable to the gentleman selected as Lieut.-Governor. Mr. Blake argued that the conduct of the Hon. Secretary of the Provinces was only to be explained by his still entertaining the opinions about the worthlessness of the territory and the folly of annexing it, which he had expressed previous to taking office. The third paragraph was then carried. Mr. Holton asked for the promised reply to Mr. McKenzie's speech. The fourth and fifth clauses were then passed. Mr. Masson (Soulanges) asked for explanations in French. Sir George E. Cartier replied that the debate was not closed yet; at the end of the debate explanations would be given as desired. Mr. White disapproved of the address. He asked for the correspondence offering office to Mr. Galt. No objection being raised, the correspondence was read. Sir Francis Hincks replied to the attack made by the members for Lambton and Chateaugay. He justified his remarks about annexation by declaring that independence meant about the same thing. The government at Washington were informed by some persons that there was a strong feeling in favour of annexation in the country, and there was no doubt that leading statesmen in the United States were extremely desirous of seeing annexation brought about. It therefore behoved all to support the Government in the task undertaken of building up British institutions. He referred to Mr. Galt's past career as a politician. He was willing to take office with him, and allow him to take the department of Finance. He did not think it lay with Sir A. T. Galt to reproach him with a policy of promoting railways by government aid or by endorsing municipal securities. Sir A. T. Galt replied. He characterized Sir Francis's financial policy as demoralizing to the country, and spoke of the offer made him as being in terms calculated to prevent his acceptance of it, by raising the question of independence as a barrier. Sir Geo. E. Cartier said it was not so intended. It was desired that he should pledge himself to resist any movement in favour of independence, while he should share the influence of the government. Sir A. T. Galt declared that he believed the ultimate fate of this country to be independence, and the best way to prevent annexation was to shape our policy so as to make that independence secure; premature independence would doubtless produce annexation also, and if proposed now he would vote against it; but the policy of the government should be directed with a view to independence, as best for the empire, and best for us. Sir G. E. Cartier replied at length to Mr. McKenzie, ridiculing the fuss made about the question of old Conservatives and old Reformers in the Cabinet. In reply to Sir A. T. Galt and Mr. Huntington, he urged that even if a bad school of politicians in England were bent on breaking up the Empire, we should prove to them here that we would not willingly permit so suicidal an act. The remaining paragraphs of the Address, down to the tenth, were passed.

Tuesday, Feb. 22. Mr. Cartwright resumed the debate. He took a hopeful view of the financial prospects of the country, but at the same time there was much need of careful management. He expressed doubts of the safety of the Government policy. Mr. Huntington made a long speech attacking Sir Francis Hincks, and characterizing him as a Rip Van Winkle in office. He deprecated the use made by the Finance Minister of Mr. Young's private conversation, and vindicated his right to discuss independence as the best policy for the country. Sir Francis Hincks replied to the attack. He said that his own private letter had been made a basis of debate. We could