

discussion of the policy of the Government, and he did not desire to hold office one hour longer than public opinion would support him in doing so. It was his intention to grapple with the various charges preferred by Mr. Mackenzie against the Government of which he had the honor to be a member; but before going into details such as the Tariff and the Coal Tax, the Banking Policy, Red River and Intercolonial Railway Policy, he would join issue with Mr. Mackenzie as to his attack on Coalition Governments, which he had most erroneously described as governments not based on party combination. He would cite Mr Mackenzie's words: "now we were told at the present time that there should be no parties, but how could there be political existence in a nation without political parties? If there be a Government, and if they have no party, then it followed that they had no policy or principles." Now he (Sir Francis Hincks) maintained, and would prove by reference to the history of our country, not only that Coalition Governments were necessary and desirable in the interests of the country, but that so far from their aiming at putting an end to party, it had invariably followed that party combination was never more active than during the existence of Coalition Governments, and a better proof of the truth of this statement could not be given than the active opposition offered by the Brownites to Sir John Macdonald's Government, since the resignation of the gentleman who has for several years been dictator of a faction in the Province of Ontario. Coalition Governments were the necessary consequence of there being three distinct parties in the State, and of it being impossible for any one of those three antagonistic parties to carry on the Government without assistance. In the public interest, therefore, party leaders had to make such concessions on minor points, and had especially to sacrifice all mere personal feelings, so as to enable them to form a strong Government. It would be found that the two parties having the greatest similarity of views coalesced against the third, which was in antagonism to both, and the natural and invariable result was that the third party became more violent than it had been previously. The consequence of coalitions was tolerance of open questions; and when such a result took place, no doubt they were open to censure, but he (Sir F. Hincks) would shew the benefits that had resulted from coalitions. The first coalition to which he would refer was the memorable one of 1660, which was formed of the Tory Churchmen and Moderate Presbyterians, and which rescued the country from a military despotism, by restoring King Charles the Second to the throne. It cannot be said that party was extinguished during the reign of that sovereign or his successor. On the contrary, it raged with such bitterness, that in less than