

escaped.

Attorney-General MOWAT said there would be no harm in receiving the report at present, and it could be adopted or not, as members saw fit, on another occasion. It would not be advisable to discuss the matter now.

Mr. FERGUSON contended that Montgomery had been a rebel. He had proof of his having been such, and he did not think the claim should be allowed by the House.

Mr. DEACON hoped that the reception of the Report by the House would not be looked upon as giving countenance to a grant of money to Montgomery. The claim was altogether too old to be considered now, and it was singular that if it had been a just one it had not been settled before.

Mr. RICHARDS was sorry to differ with the members for South Simcoe and East Hastings; but he knew something of the circumstances connected with what was called the Rebellion of 1837, and he could not see what objection there could be to the reception of the report. The stand taken by Reformers in 1837 had been looked upon merely as a political offence; and even supposing Montgomery had been a rebel, he was as much a loyal man now as anyone. There was no doubt that many of the liberties we now enjoyed were brought about by the men who had taken up arms not against the Government of the Empire, but against the administration of affairs as directed by the rulers in the country. The leaders of that rebellion even had been long since pardoned by the Queen. If Montgomery's claim was a just one, there would be no harm in the House admitting that it was so.

Mr. WOOD (Brant) asked the member for North York if the evidence the Committee had had before them was of a verbal or documentary nature.

Mr. BOULTBEE replied that the Committee had had both verbal and documentary evidence.

A division was then taken on the question of receiving the petition, which was carried. Yeas, 57; nays, 17.

YEAS—Messrs. Mowat, Crooks, Scott (Ontario), McKeellar, Pardee, Gow, William (Hamilton), McKim, Bethune, Clarke (North York), Boulton, McCall, McLeod, Fairbairn, Wilson, Oliver, Smith, Fraser, Baxter, Clamens, Farewell, Cook, Striker, Paxton, Christie, Sexton, McRae, Wood (Victoria), Patterson, Crosby, Gibson, Gibbons, Webb, Springer, Clarke (Wellington), Barber, Prince, Grange, Lauder, Rykert, Haney, Graham, Wood (Brant), McManus, Watterworth, Finlayson, Sinclair, Richards, Hamilton, Snetzinger, Harrington, Caldwell, Craig (Glengarry), Read, Scott (Grey), Calvin, Craig (Russell).—57.

NAYS—Messrs. Cameron, Macdonald, Ferguson, Williams (Durham), Deacon, Boulter, Merrick, Meredith, Code, Fitzsimmons, Corby, Gifford, Guest, Tooley, Monteith, DeRoche, Monk.—17.

Mr. BOULTBEE moved the adoption of the report, but on a point of order being raised the motion was withdrawn.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN presented the report of the Special Committee appointed to draft memorials to His Excellency the Governor-General, the Senate and the House of Commons, with reference to a Prohibitory Liquor Law, which was received.

On motion of Mr. FAIRBAIRN, one of the said memorials was ordered to be addressed to His Excellency the Governor-General, one of the Senate, and one to the House of Commons, and forwarded in the proper manner for presentation.

CROWN LANDS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT presented the report of the Crown Lands Department for 1872.

MUNICIPAL LOAN FUND.

The debate on this subject was again taken up.

Mr. GIBBONS resumed his remarks. He said that in the north of Huron and in Bruce the lands had cost the settlers about three million and a half dollars. The counties had paid in hard cash to this fund a very large sum. These counties had disdained repudiation, and the consequence was that in the English market their debentures were worth two per cent premium. If all other counties had done likewise the House would not now be troubled with this settlement. He said that some machinery would have to be provided for settling the points of difference that might arise between counties and the smaller municipalities within them. He hoped the House would carry the scheme through to a conclusion. The Government would at any rate have the credit of having settled this question which so many other Governments had been unable to grapple with.

Mr. MONTEITH explained the position of the town of Stratford and the town of Perth

in relation to the fund. He thought that Stratford was placed at a higher figure than it could pay, as there were many charges upon a town of that size. He thought that Brantford was the most favoured town of all. Some credit was due to the leader of the Government in maturing this scheme. He thought that improvements might be suggested and that a commission might issue for the purpose of enquiring into the cases of some of the municipalities.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said he proposed making a few observations on the resolutions in the hands of the Speaker, more because of the adverse remarks made upon them than for any other reason. He then went on to give the history of the origin of the scheme and the action of municipalities in granting aid to railways, which at that time were expected to be paying investments. He entered at length into the history of the management of our railway system, the building up of the main trunk lines, the large dividends that were expected to be realized from them, and the utter failure of those expectations. He said that these railways had been aided to a remarkable extent by the municipalities and the Government. Upwards of four million of dollars had been given in this way, but he believed that the result of this had been that not less than a hundred millions of dollars of foreign capital had been introduced into the country. No province of Great Britain, no State of the Union, had during that ten years advanced with such rapid strides in every avenue of industry as the Province of Canada had then done. It was true that after that expenditure there had been a consequent relapse, but in 1865 the country recovered itself, and was now progressing on what, if he was not mistaken, was a firm foundation, and was advancing on for ten more years of prosperity unparalleled in the history of this or any other country. A great deal of this prosperity, he believed, was due to the wise railway aid policy inaugurated by the late Government, and he spoke of the time when he was urging upon the House the advisability of that policy. He had then done his best to convince the

House of the great advantages that would be reaped by the country from a system of railways running transverse to the trunk lines, but his appeals had fallen upon deaf ears. The hon. member for Lincoln did not then see the force of his arguments. He believed that the older counties had some tremendous claims upon the Province. He (Mr. Wood) had at that time undertaken to show that very great justice had been done to these counties, that harbours costing over a million had been constructed all along the Lake front, roads costing \$3,113,000 had been constructed, that two millions had been spent in bridges, and that putting these amounts along with that expended on railways, it would be seen that ample justice had been done to the older counties out of the public exchequer. Viewing the matter in this light the late Government—and the present one had followed it—had considered that it would be advisable to aid new railways to open up the back country. The aid given was very small indeed, and he had argued at the time the policy was first introduced that if the railways thus aided were built at the usual cost they would bring into the country at least thirty millions of dollars. He believed that if the country could afford it it would pay to grant \$4,000 a mile to these railways instead of \$2,000. The Government that created the Municipal Loan Fund indebtedness, deliberately in 1859 passed an Act stating that no Municipality indebted to the Fund should be compelled to pay more than five per cent on their annual assessment. The hon. member for East Toronto would never be able to get a patent for discovering that the settlement proposed under that Act was not intended as final. That was apparent on the face of the Act. It was very easy for hon. members to pick out a municipality and to make comparisons between the mode of dealing with it and with other municipalities which would apparently show that it had been dealt with unjustly or too generously. He admitted the great industry shown by the member for Lincoln and his ability to gather up facts, but he could not see that his quick intellect nor that of the member for East Toronto had shown what either of them would have been satisfied with. The latter mentioned gentleman had said that he would be willing to wipe off as if with a sponge the whole indebtedness. What would he do with some of the municipalities which had paid up their indebtedness? Would he, for instance, place the county of Huron, which had always paid up, on the same footing as the town of St. Catherine's had never paid a rap since 1858? That would be a principle and a rule with a vengeance.

Mr. CAMERON said that rather than do more than justice to some or less than justice