

tions of the Act as to such portion." He explained what aid had already been granted to this Company, and to the Wellington, Grey & Bruce Company, and the circumstances which had led to the latter Company's declining to accept aid on the terms proposed. There appeared to be an objection on the part of railway companies to granting running powers over their railways to other companies, except so far as they mutually agreed upon the subject. In consequence of the refusal of the Wellington Company to accept the terms of the Order in Council, that Order became ineffectual, and then the question was what course should be taken. The course ultimately adopted was to relieve each of the companies from the condition in favour of the other, which the Order as first made had provided for, and instead of giving \$2,250 a mile to each company, it was proposed to give \$2,000, the reason of the extra \$250 being to provide for the third rail necessitated by the difference of gauge. The new Order respecting the Wellington, Grey, and Bruce Road would come up by and by. The Toronto, Grey, and Bruce, instead of going to Wingham where they were to connect with the Wellington, Grey, and Bruce, had decided to go direct from Harriston to Teeswater in a straight line, and to have a branch from Wingham to Teeswater. The Order in Council which he now asked the House to approve of sanctioned this change from the original plan, and proposed a grant of \$2,000 a mile for the mileage between Harriston and Wingham.

Mr. McCALL thought it was to be regretted that the House had not had a good opportunity of looking into the matter so that the members could give an intelligent vote on the subject. He thought it should be allowed to stand over for the present.

Mr. RYKERT concurred with the member for South Norfolk in his views. The Order in Council was based on a petition from the Toronto, Grey, and Bruce Railway Company, but he had never seen that petition.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said the papers already in possession of the House showed clearly the reason for the modification of the Order in Council of March last. A representation had been made by the Directors to the effect that the companies could not come to terms on the original arrangement, and a petition had been sent in besides.

The resolution was then carried.

WELLINGTON, GREY, AND BRUCE RAILWAY.

Attorney-General MOWAT moved:—That this House do ratify the Order in Council approved by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on the twelfth day of March, 1872, with reference to the aid granted to the Wellington, Grey and, Bruce Railway Company, which Order is to the following effect:—

"The Committee of Council have had under consideration the agreement of the 4th December, 1872, between the Corporation of the County of Bruce and the Wellington, Grey, and Bruce Railway Company, whereby it was mutually agreed that the sum of twenty-three thousand dollars in cancelled debentures of the said Corporation of the County of Bruce should be accepted in full satisfaction of the former agreement between the said parties, dated the 9th day of November, 1871, and referred to in the Order in Council of the 28th day of February, 1872, granting aid to the said Company.

"The Committee advise that the condition contained in the said Order in Council should be modified so as to be in accordance with said agreement of the 4th of December, 1872."

He explained that the resolution was in accordance with an arrangement entered into between the Corporation of the County of Bruce and the Railway Company, but the House had to give consent to that arrangement. The original agreement between the Corporation and the Company was to be found in the Sessional Papers of last year, it having been made on the 6th of November, 1871. It provided that in consideration of the assistance to be given by the County to the railway, fifty per cent. of such monies as the road received under the Railway Aid Act should be handed over to the County. Now the parties interested had agreed that the sum of \$23,000 in cancelled debentures of the Corporation of Bruce should be accepted by the Company in full satisfaction of the former agreement.

In reply to Mr. Rykert,

Hon. Mr. CROOKS explained that the Corporation of Bruce had agreed to take less from the Company than was at first proposed.

The resolution was then carried.

WHITBY AND PORT PERRY RAILWAY.

Attorney-General MOWAT then proposed to move the resolution in reference to the Port Whitby and Port Perry Railway.

Mr. LAUDER said that petitions from Ontario had just been presented to the House in respect to the aid to be granted to that line, and they ought to be considered before any definite action was taken. There was very strong opposition to the Order in Council, and the views of the people should be heard in the matter. He hoped the Government would not press the resolution now.

Mr. FAREWELL said the petition he had presented was dated yesterday. It was from the township of Whitby, or West Whitby as it was generally called. It referred to the desire of the Municipal Council there to have \$1,000 per mile refunded to them on account of the aid granted to the road by way of bonus. They wished to be placed in the same position as Uxbridge, Markham, and Scarborough, under the Municipal Loan Fund resolutions.

Attorney-General MOWAT said that some petitions had been handed to him addressed to His Excellency, but they had reference to the matter of receiving the thousand dollars a mile grant under the Municipal Loan Fund resolutions. The municipalities from which these petitions came had asked for aid to the road before and they did not withdraw from that position now. There was no difference of opinion as to the propriety of granting aid to the railway, but there was a feeling among them that they should also receive assistance on account of the bonuses they had given to the railway. The matter referred to in the resolution had been already freely discussed in the House, and he saw no reason for delaying action now, and he would therefore move the resolution of which he had given notice, namely, "That this House do ratify the Order in Council, approved by His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, on the twelfth day of March, A. D. 1873, granting aid to the Port Perry and Port Whitby Railway Company, which order is to the following effect:—The Committee of Council have had under consideration the application of the Port Perry and Port Whitby Railway Company for aid under the Acts in Aid of Railways, and they advise that, subject to the ratification of this Order in Council by resolution of the Legislative Assembly (in default of which this Order in Council is inoperative), payment be authorized to be made out of the Railway Fund to the said company of a sum equal to \$2,000 per mile of their railway for the distance which is completed between the waters of Lake Ontario and Lake Scugog: Provided, however, that this order and any ratification thereof shall be of none effect unless the Bill entitled 'An Act respecting the petition of the Port Whitby and Port Perry Railway Company under the Acts in Aid of Railways' becomes law."

Mr. McCALL fully agreed with the Attorney-General that there should be no delay in pressing the resolution, as the matter had been fully discussed in the House; but it was to be seen whether the municipalities interested in the railway were entitled to aid.

Mr. LAUDER said that certain petitions showed clearly the financial position of the railway—that a large portion of the stock had never been paid up, and that the Company had never been in a position to construct the road.

Mr. PANTON said that as the member for South Grey had accused him of holding back some of the petitions, he would explain that certain gentlemen from Reach had called upon him some days ago and read over a petition from that township to him, but they said they would go home and prepare another. He had just received a letter signed by James Graham, Reeve, and J. K. Brown, Treasurer, telling him to present the original petition, as they had concluded not to send another. He had therefore just presented that petition.

Mr. LAUDER said that it was discreditable to the hon. member for North Ontario that he should take part in a debate which interested himself personally, and went on to say that the officers and shareholders of the Company were personal friends and relatives of that gentleman, and that the Government had misled the deputations which had waited upon it in this matter. The hon. members for North and South Ontario had not the interests of their constituents at heart in their action in this matter, and would be held to account for all that they had done in the House towards depriving the townships in the vicinity of their rights. The hon. member for North Ontario had threatened