

ments. He (Mr. Mowat) considered that object to be fairly within the spirit of the Act, but he had been unable, owing to his official duties, to determine whether such application would come within the legal construction of the statute. They, however, under any circumstances, thought that the measure might be so modified as to bring such expenditures within the spirit of the Act, so that local municipalities might be able to discharge their share of liability for county debts. He considered it would be a great mistake for them to hastily revise the measure, considering the short time that had elapsed since it was passed. He had already intimated that at some future session they would have an opportunity of knowing by experience how the Act worked, and how far the money had been expended by the various municipalities for the purposes specified in the Act.

Mr. SEXTON spoke of the general satisfaction with which the Municipal Loan Fund Act had been received, and moved the following amendment:— "That, in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient at this stage of the session to take any action in regard to the provisions of the Municipal Loan Fund Act."

Mr. RYKERT objected to delaying action in this respect until next session. He asserted that the Government would not give an open vote upon the question, and had put up one of their supporters to move the amendment.

Mr. LAUDER moved, as an amendment to the amendment, "That in the opinion of this House the wishes of the ratepayers in the different municipalities entitled to payments by the Municipal Loan Fund Act of 1873 should be consulted as to the objects to which this money is to be applied, and if municipalities desire to invest the money in aid of schools, that they should have power to do so."

Mr. CRAIG (Glengarry) said it was generally admitted that the Government should have control of the money. The Clergy Reserve Fund had been squandered in many instances, and the law was made stringent on this account. He thought the Government should hesitate before they proceeded to change the law.

Mr. SINCLAIR thought it would have been more courteous to have withdrawn the motion than to have moved an amendment to the amendment. He denied that the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment was put up by the Government, and replied that he would rather vote for the original motion than the amendment.

Mr. M. C. CAMERON did not consider that anything would tend to more permanent improvement than the education of youth. He criticised several of the provisions of the statute, and denied that this payment was made a test question at the elections. He deprecated the proposal to leave the matter over until the next year, and said that the municipalities ought to have the opportunity of investing the money.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS pointed out that the municipalities would receive 5 per cent. on the money while it was in the hands of the Government.

Mr. CAMERON said they would be able to secure 8 per cent. without any difficulty if they had the money in their own hands, and proceeded to state that Mr. Blake had made a motion on the subject to the effect that the money having come from the people it should go back to the people, and be disposed of as they deemed expedient.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE was surprised at the statement made by the hon. member for East Toronto as to the motion made by Mr. Blake. The terms of Mr. Blake's resolution were precisely the same as the terms used in the Act, and that resolution formed the foundation of the Act. With regard to the subject before the House, his own individual opinion was that the provisions contained in section 12 of the Act were sufficiently full. It seemed to him almost impossible to imagine a municipality so rich as to possess so many permanent improvements that it could not invest the money in other permanent improvements or public buildings. He considered that the statute was framed wisely in that respect, and after referring to some of these modes, he said he thought it would be unwise to disturb the Act as it stood.

Mr. GRANGE objected to the Government retaining possession of the money, and thereby depriving the various municipalities of at least 3 per cent. on their money.

Mr. CROOKS said a large number of by-laws had been submitted to the Government, and would require their consideration at the earliest possible date. He was en-

deavouring to elaborate machinery for the preservation of the records in connection with every by-law.

Mr. McCALL said the Municipal Loan Fund Act was one which had given great satisfaction, and he thought it would be to the advantage of the country not to re-open the question.

Mr. HODGINS was glad to find that the Attorney-General thought there might be some means adopted by which municipalities might use their shares of the fund in discharging debts such as he had shortly before referred to. He (Mr. Hodgins) pointed out that section 13 of the Municipal Loan Fund Act empowered the Lieutenant-Governor to give his sanction to by-laws of Municipal Councils which were within the spirit of the Act, and he thought, as the debt upon his county was incurred in aiding railways, that the application of the money to the payment of that debt would come within the spirit of the Act. He felt that a liberal interpretation of the Act would enable the Government to sanction by-laws of local municipalities of Elgin applying their money to the payment of the railway aid given by this county to the Canada Southern.

Mr. DEROCHE considered that a measure of this kind should come from the Government and not from a private member. If the question were opened in this way it would be opened in other ways.

Mr. WOOD regarded the amendment of the hon. member for South Grey as more definite than the original motion. It had been admitted on the floor of the House that school teachers were poorly paid, and he thought it most desirable to do anything possible to enable trustees to increase the salaries of teachers in the High and Common Schools. The object was a most laudable one, and he could see no reason why it should not be allowed. He would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for South Grey.

Dr. GILES sincerely trusted that the amendment to the amendment would be sustained. He was favourable to the money, in cases where it was desired, being devoted to educational purposes.

Mr. McLEOD said it was a matter of congratulation that the various municipalities were so well provided with public works as had been evidenced during that discussion. He felt proud, as a Canadian, of this proof of the prosperity of the Province. He alluded to the waste in a great many instances of the Clergy Reserve Fund, which was due to there being no restriction as to its expenditure. He thought municipalities should be allowed to invest their money in other public improvements than those specified by the Act if they desired, but he regarded the amendment to the amendment as premature, and therefore could not vote for it.

Mr. BOULTBEE thought the municipalities could be trusted, and that the Government should allow this money to be used for the purpose of relieving municipalities of the burden of maintaining the schools.

Mr. SCOTT said he had informed his constituents, after enquiry, that the money would not be distributed until midsummer, but he now understood that it could be obtained upon application if the terms of the statute were complied with. He desired to set himself right upon this question.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE said it would be ready as soon as the by-laws had been examined.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS—He might have mentioned midsummer, in order to be on the safe side.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said they expected a great many demands would not come in until midsummer, but they would do their best in order to speedily meet the claims.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS rose to a point of order and stated that the motion could not be received. It was a violation of a constitutional order of the House, which prohibited a debate on any resolution which would assume to appropriate any part of the public revenue for any purpose that had not been recommended by His Excellency the Lieut. Governor.

Mr. RYKERT referred to rule 61 of the Rules of the House of Commons to show that an abstract proposition in favour of additional public expenditure did not require to be recommended by His Excellency.

Mr. BOULTBEE said the money was already appropriated, and it was only a question of how it should be dealt with.