

ways in operation, and it would be a great injury to the company if from circumstances beyond their control they were held strictly to their contract as to point of time. It was not proposed, however, to extend the time of this Bill, but only to give the County Council power to extend the time if they thought it necessary.

Hon. M. C. CAMERON supported the amendment, and said the Bill was contrary to the spirit of the Act of incorporation, which provided that no changes should be made in the conditions on which the bonus was granted without the assent of the ratepayers.

Mr. SINCLAIR spoke in favour of the Bill. The extension of time was needed for the North Riding of Bruce only, and if they had submit the question to the people of the whole county, those of the South Riding, who have got their road, would be likely to vote down a by-law for the extension. It would then, be seen that the Bill was only a simple act of justice to the North Riding; the extension was only needed for the last fifteen miles.

Hon. Mr. WOOD opposed the Bill, and attacked the member for North Bruce for supporting a measure which he (Mr. Wood) considered as bad as a measure to annul a private contract.

Mr. RYKERT defended the hon member for North Bruce, to whom, he said, he had been generally opposed, but whose consistency of conduct and acknowledged political integrity was admitted by all (hear, hear), and rendered the attack of the hon treasurer an exhibition of exceedingly bad taste. He spoke strongly in favour of the Bill, which was a fair scheme. The County Council had recently been elected by the people, and would fully express their opinion.

Mr. PARDEE thought, as a rule, they should not change a contract without the consent of the parties to it. Had they this consent in this case? He considered they had.

The debate was then continued by Mr. Ferrier, Mr. McKim, and Mr. McLeod, and a division was then taken on the amendment, as follows:

YEAS.—Messrs. Blake, Boyd, Calvin, Cameron, Darling (London), Carnegie, Cockburn, Craig (Glenary), Evans, Eyre, Ferrier, Fitzsimmons, Graham (Westings), Grahame (York), Lount, Luton, Macdonald, McDougall, McLeod, McMurrich, Matchett, Monteith, Murray, Read, Richards, Smith (Leeds and Grenville), Wallis, Wilson, Wood.—29.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anderson, Barber, Baxter, Boulter, Darling (Huron), Christie, Clemons, Cook, Coyne, Craig (Russell), Crosby, Currie, Finlayson, Galbraith, Gow, Hays, Lyon, McCall (Norfolk), McKellar, McLeod, Oliver, Pardee, Paxton, Perry, Rykert, Scott (Grey), Secord, Sexton, Sinclair, Smith (Kent), Springer, Trow, Williams (Hamilton).—33.

Mr. BLAKE moved another amendment that the Bill be referred back to the Committee with instructions to add to the 10th clause the following words:

“Provided always that the said extension shall be granted only at the same time a by-law is ordered to be submitted to the people for a bonus in aid of the construction of some railway serving the south-western townships of Bruce.” He said, by the by-law passed some time ago, one of the conditions in which the Legislature had just determined might be altered without an appeal to the people. A very great injustice was done to the south western townships of Bruce. They were compelled to contribute to the sum of a quarter of a million although a great many of them were not at all served by the railway in question. If the contract was to be altered in favour of North Bruce and certain portions of South Bruce, without an appeal to the people, surely it was quite reasonable that justice should at the same time be done to the south-western townships.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Hamilton), after consultation with the Warden of Bruce, said the matter must be left to the decision of the House.

After some discussion,

Mr. CAMERON said he could not see his way clear to support the amendment of the hon. member for South Bruce. He believed that South Bruce had sustained some injustice, but they had already the means of obviating it. He was prepared to aid the hon. gentleman in obtaining railway accommodation for South Bruce, but the motion of the hon. gentleman did not contain any justice.

Mr. BLAKE said he wished to see that all his constituents received even-handed justice, and he did not care whether any portion which were suffering under an injustice were opposed to him or not, it was his duty to see they got their rights. He had failed in his endeavours, but it was not through any fault of his own.

Mr. SINCLAIR made a few remarks in opposition to the amendment, which was then put and lost by 17 to 43.

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH gave notice of further amendment, respecting amount of bonds of the company to be moved in the third reading.

The report of the committee was then received, and the third reading fixed for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.