

Place the Company under the letter as it was under the spirit of that Aid Act. The Toronto, Grey and Bruce Company, and the others alluded to by the hon. gentleman, were excluded by the spirit as well as the letter of the Act. The failure of the Dumble contract and its assignees to build the Port Whitby and Port Perry Railway, in fact placed that railway in the same position as if its line had not been placed under contract until after the date mentioned in the general Act. There was no analogy between its case and that of the Wellington, Grey and Bruce and the other Companies. If the town of Whitby had any claim upon the railway aid to be given to the railway, that was a question to be settled between them.

Mr. LAUDER contended that the contract assumed by Mr. English had not been abandoned, and that the Company had no right to say so. That gentleman had given up his contract under an arrangement with the Company, taking a mortgage on the line, which he still holds. He said that the townships of Reach and Scugog and the town of Whitby would lose \$89,000 under this proposed Bill. He believed there was no ground for the passage of the Bill, except the threats of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Paxton) to go into Opposition unless it was passed. That hon. gentleman had last session voted for an Order in Council which placed in the hands of the municipalities assisting the Wellington, Grey, and Bruce Railway a large sum of money, instead of giving it to the railway company; but now, in order to put money into his own pocket, he voted it out of the pockets of his constituents. He (Mr. Lauder) had never seen such a barefaced bribe.

Mr. BOULTBEE thought that if the Bill gave the Whitby road further benefits than were afforded other roads in the same position, or if the money was being given to the Company instead of to the Municipalities, or if the money was only to put money in the pockets of an honourable member or members of this House, it was bad legislation, and he would vote against it.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria) moved in amendment to the amendment, that whereas no portion of the said Port Whitby and Port Perry Railway Company has received any aid from the Railway Fund; and whereas there are special and exceptional circumstances which justify the bringing of the said railway under the provisions of the Act in aid of railways, it is right that the said Bill should be now read a third time.

After some discussion,

The SPEAKER ruled the above amendment out of order.

Attorney-General MOWAT said that this matter had been very fully discussed before, and hon. members were repeating what they had said before for the purpose of expressing their virtuous indignation (Hear, hear.) The words of hon. gentlemen were strong in reverse proportion to the utter want of foundation for their assertions. They spoke of bribing the hon. member for North Ontario. He (Attorney-General) had not been aware that the hon. gentleman needed any bribe, as his relations with the Government had been of the friendliest nature. He hurled back upon gentlemen opposite the charge of bribery. They knew what it was to bribe hon. members when they came to this House, but the Government pursued a different course, and brought measures before the House only when they believed them to be in the interest of the country. He pronounced utterly untrue the insinuations that had been made in respect to the hon. member for North Ontario. The Government were of opinion that there were special circumstances connected with the case of the Whitby and Port Perry Railway which made the measure of the Government entirely within the spirit of the Act, though not within the letter of it. It was undeniable that this was a most valuable road, and no one had argued that but for the technical difficulty that existed it would have been very proper to have aided it. The road remained incomplete for want of funds, although all that could be had been raised. All the municipal bonuses that had been granted and all the proposed Government aid would be necessary to complete the line. It was therefore nonsense to speak of giving back to municipalities any portion of the money they had granted, although, perhaps, it would have been well to return portions of it if it had been found that they had given more money than was necessary with the Government aid to build the road. No other course had been open to the Government, in pursuance of the railway policy of the former Government, than to aid this railway.

Mr. MACDONALD said that when a statement of facts damaging to the Government had been made out, the Attorney-General adopted the course of abusing the Opposition and making charges against them

He referred to the decision arrived at by the late Premier, Mr. Blake, when the member for North Ontario asked for aid to the Whitby road, that as there was a doubt as to whether the line was really entitled to aid none could be given. If there was an amendment wanted to the Railway Aid Act it should have been brought in last session, and the question decided then, instead of bringing in a Bill now granting exceptional favours to one road.

The amendment of the member for Lincoln was then put and lost on the following division—Yeas 18, nays 52.

YEAS.—Messrs. Macdonald, Rykert, Boulter, Merrick, Meredith, Calvin, Craig (Russell), Monteith, Tooley, Read, Code, Corby, Lauder, Gifford, Williams (Durham), Ferguson, Boulton, Monk—18.

NAYS.—Messrs. Mowat, Crooks, Scott (Ottawa), McKellar, Pardee, McKim, Deroche, Clarke (Norfolk), McCall, McLeod, Wilson, Oliver, Williams (Hamilton), Baxter, Clemens, Farewell, Cook, Striker, Hodgins, Christie, Sexton, McKee, Fairbairn, Wood (Victoria), Patterson, Crosby, Dawson, Gibson, Gibbons, Webb, Springer, Clarke (Wellington), Barber, Smith, Wells, Ardagh, Coyne, Robinson, Wood (Brant), Graham, Watterworth, Finlayson, Sinclair, Deacon, Hamilton, Snetsinger, Haney, Harrington, Fitzsimmons, Craig (Glengarry), Caldwell, Guest—52.

Mr. LAUDER then moved another amendment to the effect that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of making provision therein that the said grant shall not be paid over to the said Railway Company without the consent of such municipalities as aided the said railway before the passage of the said Railway Aid Act of 1871.

After some discussion as to whether the amendment was in order, previous notice of it not having been given, the Speaker ruled that it was in order.

Mr. LAUDER then remarked that it was merely as an act of justice to the municipalities interested that he proposed his amendment, and he was determined to press it.

Mr. FAREWELL said he was extremely obliged to his hon. friend from South Grey for his expression of sympathy on behalf of the people of Ontario county, but he (the speaker) did not know on what grounds that sympathy rested. Certainly Reach, Scugog, and Whitby had not asked the hon. gentleman to take position as their counsel, and he apprehended that the sympathy manifested was not called for or wanted. As regarded the meeting at Whitby alluded to, he would say that that meeting was held in connection with other matters than a discussion of the railway question, and it had been the desire of some present to make a point against the Government. He showed the importance of the Whitby road to the back country and the section through which it passed, and said that the proposed grant in its aid was a proper one for the House to vote.

Mr. WOOD explained the difference between the case of the municipalities aiding the Whitby road and that of those aiding the Wellington, Grey and Bruce, in the latter of which cases there had existed conditions to the bonus which compelled the completion of the road. The aid now proposed to be granted would be only enough to complete the road; and of what benefit would it be to the municipalities to be recouped a small portion of their outlay, when at the same time the consequent reduction in the amount payable to the Company would prevent the completion of the railway?

Mr. RYKERT and Mr. CALVIN supported the amendment.

Hon. Mr. MCKELLAR showed that the Whitby road was entitled to the grant asked for, and that the case of another railway alluded to by some speakers was not a parallel one.

Mr. BOULTBEE followed in support of the amendment.

Mr. PAXTON was proceeding with some remarks in support of the motion, when the hour of six o'clock having arrived the House rose.

After recess,

Mr. HODGINS moved the third reading of the Bill to amend the Acts relating to the Credit Valley Railway Company.

On motion of Mr. MACDONALD the Bill was referred back to the Committee of the Whole, and amended by adding a clause respecting the debentures of the city of Toronto.

An amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. CROOKS respecting the residence of the Trustees appointed by municipalities was also adopted.

The third reading was, after farther debate, allowed to stand over.