

4
their heavy liabilities, which had for so long a period existed, to their injury. He (the speaker) gave figures to show that instead of \$13,000,000 being wiped off in the settlement of the Loan Fund, as had been stated by the member for Lincoln, there was only in reality the sum of \$10,108,387 proposed to be written off. On the whole, the scheme was a very fair one, and though there might be a shade of inequality in a few instances, it would be impossible to devise a measure thoroughly perfect in every respect. He believed that the Government had done the

very best that could be done in the matter, and were entitled to the support of the House for the manner in which they had framed the scheme.

Mr. CAMERON proposed to deal more with certain principles in the resolutions than details, in order to show that the favours of the Government had been unfairly distributed. It had been represented that the Act of 1859 made the debts of the municipalities reduced by the sum that five per cent upon the assessed value would make the capital of the debt at that time; but that Act had been repealed, and it was the Consolidated Municipal Loan Act that bore that construction. He went on to refer to the manner in which it was proposed to deal with Brantford, as compared with St. Catharines and London, and claimed that the two latter places were not to be dealt with so liberally as the former, considering the circumstances in connection with each. It was rather singular, he thought, that Berlin was to receive \$21,000 more than was originally proposed by the resolutions when first brought down. Hamilton also received considerable favour from the Government; and altogether it would appear that exceptions were made in favour of localities that had representatives supporting the Government. The county of Huron, having two representatives in the House who supported the Administration, was liberally dealt with. The townships, however, lying to the north-east of Uxbridge—Brock, Eldon, Bexley, Laxton, Digby, and Somerville—which had all aided the Nipissing Railway, were left out in the cold, though at the time they granted the bonuses they had not the slightest idea that the Government was going to give any aid to the railway, and they had as much right to assistance now as the township of Scott. Injustice was contemplated also to the municipalities which had aided the Port Whitby and Port Perry Railway, as they were to receive nothing in return for the assistance they had afforded that road, although by a special Act it had been brought under the provisions of the Railway Aid Act.

Mr. PAXTON said that the hon. member for Toronto, when a member of the Government, had shut out Uxbridge and the northern counties by his action in regard to the Toronto & Nipissing Railway.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said that the late Government had been careful on that occasion, as on all others, that the provisions of the Railway Aid Act should not ever be violated; but the present Government was acting in violation of all justice in defrauding the municipalities along the line for the sake of benefiting the hon. member for North Ontario and his village and railway. The scheme now brought down by the Government was not at all the scheme that had been foreshadowed by the Hon. Mr. Blake. The hon. gentleman had arranged the scheme for the sake of influencing persons outside, so that more support might be brought to him and his friends. The present scheme was one that the people had reason to complain of on account of the violated pledges of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman's calculations had been exceedingly loose. At first he proposed only to draw upon the surplus for about \$200,000, but now he found that he would have to spend about \$800,000, and this amount would be largely increased by the proposed arrangement with the Brockville & Ottawa and the municipalities interested. He did not, however, know that—considering the mess into which this matter had been brought by hon. gentlemen—they could do any better than make the arrangement they now proposed. He did not think that the town of Prescott suffered any loss under the Act respecting the Bytown Railway. It was, he said, the Grand Trunk Railway which had done Prescott the injury, by making it a mere way station. There was no equity or justice in the way in which the several indebted municipalities had been dealt with. The Government were abrogating entirely the functions of government.

Mr. GIBBONS protested against the inaccuracy of the charge that the Government was giving any preference to its own supporters. If justice was given to the town of Goderich it was very rough justice indeed. The town

of St. Catharines had its debt reduced in a much larger proportion than that of Goderich, which had paid into the treasury a much larger proportion of the amount it had borrowed than any other municipality. Probably that was because he was a Reformer, while the representative of St. Catharines was a Conservative and an opponent of the Government. (Laughter.) Stratford and London had also paid in much less than Goderich, and yet they complained that their debt had not been sufficiently reduced. The little town of Goderich had acted nobly in the repayment of interest, and he thought that it had hardly been fairly dealt with. He admitted, however, that the scheme as a whole was a fair one. The county of Huron had nothing to complain of, but, out of the seven towns that borrowed \$100,000 from the Municipal Loan Fund Goderich had been dealt with less generously than any of them except Chatham.

Mr. GIBSON said that the members who had objected to the scheme had not shown any way of bettering it. Surely it was only fair that the county of Huron, which had always paid up its interest faithfully, should have been relieved. Huron and Bruce had in one year paid \$55,000, although the farmers in the county had been forced to sell every bushel of grain to pay their taxes. This time the neighbouring county, Perth, because it sent a representative who supported the Conservative Government, had been allowed to go without paying a cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite should be the last to speak of supporting supporters. He thought that the hon. member for Victoria was wrong in stating that we would not have any revenue but from woods and forests. Half as much was spent in opening up that new country as was received from that source. It was therefore unfair in the hon. member to say that this surplus should all be spent in the back townships. Hon. members were too much inclined to look at this matter from merely local stand points. This was shown by the hon. member for Lincoln, whose heart all the time he was speaking was in the town of St. Catharines. (Hear, hear.) It was very easy for hon. gentlemen opposite to get up and find fault, but not one of them had shown how a better arrangement could have been made. It would have been much worse to have left the Fund in the position in which it was. He himself might have felt inclined to find fault with some of the provisions of the arrangement—the relieving, for instance, of some of the municipalities that had not paid up as well as they might have done; but he could not see how the difficulty could be remedied. On the whole he thought that the eastern end of the Province had fared best. He did not see how the town of St. Catharines could complain; it had paid nothing since 1858, and ought to try to go at it now. The city of London was getting an asset that would nearly pay the interest on their indebtedness.

At six o'clock the debate and the House were adjourned.

After recess.

JOHN MONTGOMERY,

Mr. BOULTBEE moved that the report of the special Committee appointed to enquire into the claim of John Montgomery be read.

—Carried.

On the motion that the report be received,

Mr. MACDONALD trusted that the motion would not be pressed now, as members should have time to consider the subject matter of the petition and report. The reception of the report would be in a measure tantamount to the House agreeing that the claim was a just one.

Mr. BOULTBEE said that the member for South Leeds evidently did not know anything about the matter. The Committee had examined carefully into the subject, and had ascertained that personal property to the value of \$1,589 had been taken by the forces of the Government from the petitioner during the Rebellion of 1837, and that property and furniture was burned to the value of \$15,000 and upwards. The claim had been enquired into by the Government and admitted. The report recommended nothing.

Mr. MCCALL thought the report should be received.

Mr. PRINCE said that he had carefully looked into the claim of John Montgomery, and there was no doubt that that person had lost a good deal of property in 1837 through the troops of her Majesty and by fire.

Mr. CORBY thought it would not be right to take up a money claim of the kind after the lapse of so long a time. There was little doubt that Montgomery had been a rebel, and that while other men had been hanged for offences against the Government he had