

Mrs. Hubbard, stating that she had held \$2,000 of these debentures which she had sold for \$30 store pay. An affidavit to this effect was on its way, and he thought, until the House had further information before it, the consideration of the Bill should be postponed.

Mr. GRAHAM (Hastings), inquired whether at the time these debentures were issued, township Councils had authority to pass a by-law to create debt without the assent of the rate-payers, and, if they had, whether they had authority to create debt to the amount of \$16,000?

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said it had never been contended that the corporation had not power to create this debt, if it had done it in a formal manner. There was no restriction at that time on the passage of such a by-law by the Township Council. The defect in the by-law was that it did not provide a sinking fund or state the rate to be levied.

Mr. HAYS narrated some of the facts connected with the issue of these debentures, and suggested that the debentures should be paid up to such amount as the holders showed they had paid for them. He was proceeding to read Mrs. Hubbard's telegram, when

Mr. LAUDER rose to order, and insisted that it was against parliamentary practice to read telegrams in the course of debate.

Mr. RYKERT wished the hon. gentleman to point out the rule which would be violated by the reading of the telegram.

Mr. LAUDER said the hon. gentleman was very sharp, but he ought to know that what he (Mr. Lauder) had stated was correct. It was only recently that the rule had been so far relaxed as to allow newspaper extracts to be read in debate.

Mr. OLIVER gave another version, different from that of the member for Huron, with regard to the issue of the debentures, and contended that justice to the widows and orphans who held them, required that they should be legalised.

Mr. CURRIE said that the whole question was, Were these debentures issued in good faith? were they taken up in good faith and did the township receive benefit from them in the expenditure on its plank-road? These questions must be answered in the affirmative. There was evidence also that the by-law was approved of by the people, inasmuch as a subsequent by-law for a loan of \$1600 for the same purpose was sanctioned by the vote of a large majority of the rate-payers. If the money first obtained had not been expended in accordance with the wishes of the people, they would not have sanctioned the second by-law. This House should not deprive individuals of their rights, in order to screen a wealthy township.

Mr. LUFON said certain members of the Bayham council formed themselves into a road company, and then issued township debentures in favour of the company. A measure similar to this had been submitted to the Canadian Parliament and had been thrown out.

Dr. McGILL spoke in favour of the Bill.

The first, second and third clauses were put and declared carried.

Mr. HAYS rose to speak to the third clause.

Mr. LOUNT rose to order. The clause was carried.

Mr. HAYS—I called "not carried."

The CHAIRMAN said he had pronounced the clause carried.

Mr. HAYS begged, as a representative of the people, to protest against this stifling of discussion, and the carrying of the Bill in this hurried manner.

Mr. SCOTT (Ottawa) suggested that the hon. member might have an opportunity of moving an amendment, and renewing the discussion at the third reading.

Mr. BLAKE said they had had the whole of this discussion before, and it would be well to get rid of it now by going back on the third clause.

Hon. Mr. CARLING agreed with Mr. Blake that the house should go back on the clause.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON resisted the proposition. He did not want the time of the house unnecessarily occupied with a discussion, which was merely obstructive in its character, after the principle of the Bill had been adopted.

Mr. CUMBERLAND urged the importance of great caution, lest the house should encourage speculation on its legislation. He would not legalise these debentures beyond the value they represented in the hands of their present holders. He suggested that the committee rise and report progress, and that a select committee be appointed to make further investigation as to the facts of the case.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON refused to accept the proposition of the member for Algoma. All parties had had an opportunity of being heard before the Private Bills Committee. If Mrs. Hubbard had a right to receive \$2000 from the township, the person who bought it even for \$30, had the same right in law.