

ing system, which was wrong in principle. He thought the Bill was one which the Legislature should not allow to become law, because the large taxation would prevent settlement of Crown Lands in the grouped section, because it would interfere with pending litigation, and because it was wrong in principle that a portion of a county not interested in the railway should be compelled to assume and become responsible for the debt of another portion of the county incurred to aid that railway, when the County Council are of opinion that the grouped section will be unable to pay the amount.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

#### ELGIN ASSOCIATION.

After recess.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said that he intended on Thursday evening to ask the indulgence of the House to make his statement respecting the charges made against him in connection with the Elgin Association.

Mr. CAMERON said that the hon. gentleman could not set apart a night for making his statement. Much would depend upon the state of the business of the House. The hon. gentleman had not chosen to reply to the many demands made upon him for explanations, and as he had allowed the matter to stand so long he might as well allow it to stand over till next session. He (Mr. Cameron) had not formed any opinion as to whether or not the hon. gentleman was or was not guilty of the charges made against him, but he thought that any explanations made by the hon. gentleman should be made before a Committee.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said he had already stated that it was utterly impossible for him to make his explanations earlier in the session, because he had been called upon to prove a negative, and had to obtain from Britain the evidence which was necessary to disprove the charges made. Now he was in possession of such evidence as he thought would be satisfactory to the House. He might claim, as a matter of privilege, the right to make this statement, but he did not wish to force that right.

Mr. CAMERON said that the hon. gentleman could make his statement at any time and place he liked, but if he had any evidence to offer, he should do so before a committee appointed to hear it.

Attorney General MOWAT said his hon. friend had made the statement of his innocence more than once, but now wished to present to the House evidence which would support that statement. Charges had been made against the hon. gentleman in the House and out of it, and he (Attorney-General) was sure the House would feel it was a fitting thing that his hon. friend should be allowed to make his statement in the same manner that the hon. member for Niagara had been allowed to explain a charge made against him.

Mr. RYKERT said the charge against the member for Niagara had been made in the House and was very properly answered in the House. No one had made any charge against the Commissioner of Agriculture in this House. If that hon. gentleman made his statement and brought his evidence before the House, those who made the charges would not have an opportunity of substantiating them.

The SPEAKER quoted from May to show that it was customary to allow members to make personal explanations whenever they desired to do so.

After some remarks from Mr. FERGUSON and a reply from Mr. McKELLAR the Speaker ruled the discussion out of order.

#### FENELON FALLS RAILWAY.

The debate on the third reading of the Fenelon Falls Railway Bill was resumed by

Mr. WOOD (Victoria), who showed the benefits that would arise to the back country from the construction of the proposed railway. The Railway Aid Act—one of the best measures ever put forth by the former Government—expressly declared by its provisions that railways extending into or in the direction of the free grant districts should be aided. The Fenelon Falls Railway was in every respect a road that came under the provisions of that Act. The southern portion of the county of Peterborough had good railway facilities, but the northern portion had not; and the only chance of the people resident in the latter for getting railway facilities was that afforded them by the Fenelon Falls Company. The town of Lindsay had given \$60,000 bonus in aid of the railway, and \$80,000 more was asked for from the county of Victoria, so that the Company wanted practically \$140,000 from Victoria before Peterborough was touched, and yet it had been asserted that Victoria wanted the money of Peterborough for its own benefit. Whatever money would be given by the back town.

ships of Peterborough would be expended in that section. It had been said that all the by-laws in aid of the railway had been voted down in Victoria. The fact was, there was only one defeated, and that was because Fenelm was asked for a larger bonus than it could afford, and the by-law was lost, the Mariposa and Somerville by-laws being withdrawn. Mr. Carnegie, the ex-member for West Peterborough and editor of the Peterborough Review, stated lately in that paper that the back townships of the county were perfectly good for a bonus of \$60,000, and the Council of the county would not run the slightest risk in issuing debentures to that amount under certain restrictions. The proper machinery asked for by the Review was now provided for in the Bill. He referred to a few other points in the speech of the member for West Peterborough, whose amendment, he thought, was unjust in principle to the people of the back country, who had strong claims upon the House. There was nothing wrong in the "grouping clause" in the present measure, which was equitably framed, and he trusted the House would pass it.

Mr. BOULTBEE and Mr. READ supported the amendment of the member for West Peterboro.

The House then divided, and the amendment was lost.—Yeas 27, nays 31.

YEAS—Messrs. Baxter, Sexton, Gow, Deroche, McCall, Webb, Boultee, Fairburn, MacManns, Ardagh, Rykert, Deacon, Williams (Durham), Sinclair, Finlayson, Gifford, Haney, Harrington, Caldwell, Merrick, Code, Read, Meredith, Calvin, Tooley, Monteith—26.

NAYS—Messrs. McKellar, Pardee, Fraser, Smith, Barber, Clarke (Wellington), Springer, Clemens, Williams (Hamilton) Hodgins, Cook, Gibbons, Gibson, Dawson, Striker, Paxton, Wood (Victoria), Crosby, Clarke, (Norfolk), Patterson, Cameron, Macdonald, Boulter, Lauder, Snetsinger, Craig (Glen-gary, Grahame, Watterworth, Corby, Fitzsimmons, Grange—31.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

#### WELLINGTON, GREY AND BRUCE RAILWAY.

On motion of Mr. SCOTT (Grey), a Bill to correct an error in the Act relating to the Wellington, Grey & Bruce Railway Company, passed this session, was by unanimous consent of the House read a second time and passed through Committee of the Whole.

On the motion for the adoption of the report, Mr. OLIVER raised a point of order, because he himself had a Bill which had been passed this session, which he wished to have amended but could not do so.

Mr. RYKERT said the objection could not now be taken, as the House had consented to suspend the rules on the subject.

After some debate the report was adopted, and the Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ORILLIA ASYLUM.

Mr. ARDAGH asked if the Government, in view of the statement made on the 19th instant, in the House of Commons, by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that the Orillia Lunatic Asylum property belongs to this Province, were still of a contrary opinion, as expressed in this House during the present session; and, in any case, if it was the intention of the Government to take steps at once to settle the question of ownership in favour of the Province, so that the said property can be made use of when required for some public purpose.

Atty.-Gen. MOWAT stated that in consequence of the statement made in the House of Commons on the subject of the Orillia Lunatic Asylum it was the intention of the Government to open correspondence with the Government at Ottawa on the subject of that asylum.

#### INTOXICATING LIQUOR.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN moved the following resolutions:—

Whereas 368 petitions from upwards of 28,000 inhabitants of this Province have been presented to this Assembly, praying for the passage of an Act prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as beverages within this Province.

And whereas 39 similar petitions have been presented to this Assembly, from Municipal Corporations within this Province, and whereas it has been held and ruled by the Speaker of this Assembly, that this Assembly has not, under the provisions of the Confederation Act, power to grant the prayer of the said petitioners.