

WHITBY AND PORT PERRY RAILWAY.

The debate on the Bill respecting the position of the Port Whitby and Port Perry Railway Company, under the Railway Act, was then resumed by

Mr. PAXTON, who said that the member for North York had insinuated that the Government intended to take the public money and put it into the pockets of private individuals. That was a most unwarranted insinuation. The member for North York had professed Reform principles, and had managed to get returned by the narrow majority of five, while he (the speaker) had been returned for his riding after four years' service by a majority of 860. He understood, also, that insinuations had been thrown out by an hon. member that he was to get money by the passage of the Bill, and that that money was required to pay off an execution in the hands of the sheriff against himself. On hearing this he (the speaker) wrote to the sheriff, and that gentleman had replied that there was no ground for any such statement or insinuation; there was not a particle of truth in the report, which had nothing to rest upon. The member for South Grey had also tried to make out that he was the champion of the people of North and South Ontario, though they had not asked him to become so. On the other hand the County Council of Ontario had sent a petition, endorsed by 26 out of the 28 members, asking for aid to the road, and that petition was backed up by one from the Town Council of Whitby; both of them being backed up by the views of influential men on each side of politics in Reach, Songog, Whitby township and Whitby town, together with the directors and shareholders of the Company. In regard to the meeting which had been held at Whitby, spoken of by certain honourable gentlemen, and a report of which had appeared in one of the papers, he had learned that that meeting was attended by about forty gentlemen, amongst whom were John Ham Perry, Sheriff Lawder, and others, who if they could do anything to embarrass or defeat the Government would do it. There was some sort of a resolution passed asking the House not to let the Bill be adopted at present; but the deputation had not yet turned up, and he did not think that they ever would. In reference to the position of the railway, he said that the neighbouring municipalities had come forward nobly in its aid. He himself had taken \$10,000 worth of stock, and his personal friends had also taken large amounts of stock and had paid them all up. The hon. member for Stormont had been accused of being the paid counsel for this Company, but the fact was that that hon. gentleman had not received a cent from it, but was employed on the other side, as was also the hon. Treasurer. The Company would, after all the proposed grant, still owe a large sum. He himself was not a Director, as had been asserted, but simply a shareholder holding the bonds of the Company as his collateral security. The Company was so poor that it could not buy rolling stock sufficient to accommodate the public. He thought that the hon. member for West Durham was opposing this Bill because he was afraid that if this Company got assistance he would be able to go on to the Georgian Bay and rival the line in which that hon. gentleman was interested. During the last election hon. gentlemen opposite had raised the cry in his county that if he had voted for the Sandfield Government he could have had assistance to this railway. He had been offered \$100,000 for this line not half an hour before the old Government resigned. He had, however, sacrificed his private wishes for the sake of the general good of the country. He said that Messrs. Perry, Lauder, and Reynolds, of Whitby, friends of gentlemen opposite, had watched him for a whole session and had urged him to oppose the passing of the Nipissing Railway Bill, and had abused him for doing justice to that Company. He was not now asking anything from the House that was not fair, and until he asked something that was not due to the portion of the country he represented, he claimed that he should not have such opprobrium cast upon him as had been attempted by hon. gentlemen opposite. He then went on to explain his action in reference to procuring the construction of a lock at Lindsay, and the refusal of the late Government to accede to that request because he declined to support it. He entered at length into a description of the way in which he was harassed by the then leader of the Government and his friends in Ontario who desired favours from the Government. The speaker concluded by again repelling the unjust insinuations thrown out against the Railway Company and himself by the members for North York, South Grey and Lincoln.

Mr. MACDONALD said it was an old axiom that a man who was his own lawyer had a fool for his client; and the hon. member for North Ontario must pardon him when he said that if the advocacy of the Bill had been left to the Attorney-General, who had made so vigorous a speech on behalf of it in the afternoon, it would have been better for the Bill. He (the speaker) thought it was most discreditable for the member for North Ontario to bring up accusations against the late Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, after that gentleman had gone to his grave honoured by both political parties. He considered that the return of Mr. Gibbs to the Dominion Parliament for North Ontario was an indication that the previous speaker's course in this House would not be endorsed by his constituents when he went before them for re-election again.

Mr. BOULTBEE considered that the member for North Ontario had made most damaging statements concerning himself, but so far from Mr. Sandfield Macdonald offering \$58,000 for his support, he (the speaker) did not believe that that gentleman, who was extremely economical would give fifty-eight hundred cents for it. He repeated that the Bill sought for exceptional legislation, and he could not support it.

Mr. SINCLAIR deprecated the personal attacks made upon the member for North Ontario by gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House. He had the highest opinion of his integrity, and was sure that the Bill was not introduced by him for the purpose of advancing his own private interests. He (the speaker) believed that the railway in question came within the spirit if not within the letter of the Railway Aid Act, and he should therefore support the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER endorsed the statements made by the member for North Ontario, in reference to the pressure brought to bear upon him by the late Government, for he was in a position to state that such pressure had been exerted.

Mr. DEACON spoke in favour of the Bill, believing that the grant asked for came within the spirit and meaning of the Railway Aid Act, and in accordance with the policy of the late Administration, and also of the present one.

Mr. McCALL felt it his duty to support the Bill; and, at the same time, regretted that so much personal feeling had been shown by members in the House when discussing the principle of the measure. So far as regarded the charges made against the late Mr. Sandfield Macdonald he could say that he (the speaker) had ever preserved his character as an independent member of the House, and had never had any pressure brought to bear upon him by that honourable gentleman when Premier.

Mr. LAUDER said that for the present he would withdraw his motion, but if, when the Order in Council came down to the House, proof was not adduced that the municipalities interested were satisfied, he would renew his motion.

Mr. ARDAGH was in favour of the Bill for various reasons. The Vice-President of the Midland Railway, a road to some extent a rival of the one under discussion, had stated in private conversation that it would be only doing an act of justice to the Whitby and Port Perry Railway if the grant was given it, so that it could be relieved from its financial difficulties.

The House would not consent to the withdrawal of Mr. Lauder's amendment, and a vote was accordingly taken on it, when it was declared lost on the following division:— Yeas 9, nays 51.

YEAS—Messrs. Macdonald, Ferguson, Merrick, Boulter, Rykert, Lauder, Scott (Grey), Molk, Boultee—9.

NAYS—Messrs. Mowat, Crooks, Scott (Ottawa), McKim, Pardee, McKellar, Williams (Hamilton), Hodgins, Oliver, Wilson, McLeod, Clarke (Norfolk), Deroche, McCall, Baxter, Smith, Barber, Clark (Wellington), Springer, Webb, Gibbons, Gibson, Clemens, Farewell, Cook, Striker, Crosby, Patterson, Christie, Sexton, McRae, Fairbairn, Wood (Victoria), Deacon, Fitzsimmons, Tooley, Haney, Monteith, Craig (Russell), Guest, Grange, Ardagh, Caldwell, Harrington, Williams (Durham), Graham, Robinson, Watterworth, Finlayson, Sinclair, Suetsinger—51.

The original motion was then carried, and the Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTION LAW.

On motion of Atty. Gen. MOWAT the House then went into Committee on Bill to amend the law respecting the Election of Members for the Legislative Assembly, and respecting the trial of such elections. The Bill, after some amendments in detail proposed by the Attorney-General had been adopted, was reported.

HIGH SCHOOL LAW.

In answer to Mr. MACDONALD, Atty.-Gen. MOWAT said that the High School Bill presented some very great difficulties with regard to the number of things that had been urged upon him to adopt. Some of the amendments were pressing. The Bill was in print, and the only difficulty as to going on with it was the doubt as to the length of the Session.

The House adjourned at 12 o'clock.