

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

SECOND PARLIAMENT—SECOND SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, March 12, 1873.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

PETITIONS.

The following petitions were presented:—

Mr. Graham—Of the County Council of Hastings, praying for certain amendments to the Municipal Act.

Mr. Ferguson—Of the Township Council of Innes, praying for certain amendments to the Bill to amend the Act incorporating the Hamilton and North-western Railroad Company.

Mr. Lauder—Of the Executive Committee of the Methodist New Connexion Church of Canada, praying for certain amendments to the Bill to amend the Act respecting Religious Institutions.

Mr. Farewell—Of the County Council of Ontario, praying that no change be made respecting High School Districts.

Mr. Oliver—Of Chas. Hussey and others, of South Norwich; of N. T. Scott and others, of Dereham; of Spencer Day and others, of Blenheim; of Francis Sim and others, of Blandford; of Hiram Shattuck and others, of South Norwich; of Hugh Ross and others, of Blenheim; of Robert Vandecau and others, of East Oxford; of Thos. Daniel and others, of Blenheim; of John Kerr and others, of West Zorra; of F. Comfort and others, of South Norwich; and of Henry Mott and others, of West Zorra, all praying for certain amendments to the School Act.

One petition in favour of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Ardagh—That on the third reading of Bill No. 19 respecting municipal institutions he will move that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to strike out of clause 74 the words, "or shop keeper licensed to sell spirituous liquors by retail;" in other words, making such shop-keepers eligible for election to a Municipal Council.

Hon. Mr. McKellar—That when the House is in Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 149, to incorporate the Erie & Huron Railway Company, he will move the following amendments:—

Amendments to preamble— "To some point in or near the village of Errol in the township of Plympton, on or near the shore of Lake Huron, or to," preceding the words, "the town of Sarnia."

Amendment to section 1 after the words, "R. S. Woods and Lionel Johnson, Dr Newman, J. Lillie, James Keating, Andrew Elliot, and George D. McPherson."

Amendment to section 3—After the words, "village of Petrolia as convenient for said Railway Company," add "thence to a point on the Grand Trunk Railway, at or near the village of Errol, in the township of Plympton, and thence to the shore of Lake Huron;" and to be added at the end of the third section, "Also, that the said Company may within five years construct a branch from some point on its main line, commencing at or near the town of Chatham, thence to the village of Wallaceburgh, and thence to some point on the St. Clair River." Also, after the words, "proposed road of the said Company," the following addition, "But in case the said Erie and Huron Railway Company cannot make satisfactory arrangements with the said Dresden and Oil Springs Railway Company, then that the said Erie and Huron Railway Company may construct their line from Dresden to Oil Springs, independent of said Dresden and Oil Springs Company."

Amendment to section 13—After the words "shall be held," strike out "in the city of Toronto," and insert after the word "Day," "as the Directors may determine."

Amendment to section 14—Strike out "in the city of Toronto."

AN ERROR.

Mr. RYKERT drew the attention of the Speaker to the fact that in to-day's Votes and Proceedings of the House, a division list appeared, in an amendment moved by the member for South Ontario, in reference to the location of the Agricultural College at Whitby. The fact was there was no division taken on that amendment at all, but it was declared lost without the ayes and nays being called for. From the list it would also appear that the member for South Ontario had voted against his own motion—the Ayes being 26, and the Nays 39—but it was all incorrect.

Attorney-General MOWAT said that the previous speaker was right, for no division had been taken on the amendment referred to. The oversight would of course be rectified.

ESTATES OF INTESTATES.

Attorney-General MOWAT introduced a Bill respecting the administration of the estates of intestates in which the Crown is interested.

WHITBY AND PORT PERRY RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS moved that the Bill respecting the position of the Whitby and Port Perry Railway Company, under the Acts in aid of Railways, be read a third time.

Mr. RYKERT moved in amendment that the Bill be read this day three months. He remarked that the town of Whitby and the townships of Reach, Scugog and Port Whitby, which had all given bonuses to the railway in question, were deprived of the \$1,000 per mile allowance under the Municipal Loan Fund resolutions, while it was designed to give money to a railway company which had for some time been in financial difficulties. A public meeting had been held in Whitby the other evening at which a deputation was appointed to confer with the Government in reference to the Bill before the House, and he thought the views of that deputation should be fully learned before the measure was pushed any further. There were numerous railway companies in the Province seeking for Government aid and could not get it—such as the Wellington, Grey & Bruce, the Toronto, Grey & Bruce, and the Nipissing railways—and it was unfair to single out the Whitby road as one to receive benefits denied to others. It was exceptional legislation that was asked for by the Treasurer, and it would be a bad precedent if the Bill were allowed to pass. Instead of a grant being made to those municipal corporations which had aided the road, it was designed to put money into the pockets of a railway company to relieve them from financial embarrassment. He asked the House not to countenance legislation of the kind sought for.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said the hon. member evidently did not understand the difference that existed between the circumstances of this railway and those of the other railways he had mentioned. The Bill now before the House might have been brought down in the shape of a general Bill. The principle of this Bill was to relieve this Company from a technical objection which prevented them from making application under the Railway Act. The object was to