

against the scheme. Did they find any violent opposition to the proposal in the press of the country? Had not such papers as The Toronto World, The Mail and Empire and The News, papers apt to criticize the Ontario Government, even without reason, been extremely mild in their opposition to the proposal? It was noticeable, too, that the leader of the Opposition himself had not, in connection with this question, made use of such "swollen vocabulary" as he had used on many former occasions. The whole point of the scheme was whether the security for the Government guarantee was ample, and he had, he thought, proved beyond doubt that the tangible securities were more than sufficient to protect the Province. So far from the speech of the member for the "Soo" being "injudicious," as stated by Mr. Whitney, he was of opinion that it ranked amongst the very best delivered on the subject. It had been suggested that the Dominion Government should have come to the assistance of the company. Well, the Dominion Government had last year placed on the statute books a bounty of \$7 per ton on steel rails. The steel rail plant would be the most valuable wealth-producing industry of the many allied industries of the "Soo." "We, through our railway, are assisting these allied industries, and the Dominion Government, through its bounty, and through its duty on steel rails, will give them additional assistance. The Dominion Government is really now acting exactly on the line we should wish it to in order to make our investment successful."

Mr. Whitney's Estimate of Securities.

The Premier, amid loud applause from the Government benches, quoted from a report in The Mail and Empire of Mr. Whitney's speech in opposing the granting of land subsidies to the Algoma Central Railway. Mr. Whitney had described this grant as "1,600,000 acres of the richest pulp and mineral land in the world, which would yield \$60,000 a year in dues alone," and proceeded to say that he had within the last ten days been informed by a gentleman of the highest commercial standing that a syndicate could be formed to buy these lands at \$5 per acre. "I hope that gentleman has not gone to the shades of the majority," said the Premier. "I hope that he is still living above ground, and that he will come forward, if this scheme should fail, with his offer of \$5 per acre. That would give us a security of \$7,500,000 in land alone for the guarantee of \$2,000,000."

The remark had been made that this proposition was without precedent. Perhaps it was. Had they no faith in their own judgment? Who was to make precedents for them? That House itself, with its single Chamber, was without precedent. Confederation was without precedent. They could not wait for precedents; they could not allow these industries to languish. "The Opposition that confronts me," said the Premier, "is without precedent. I never saw such an Opposition in my thirty years of public life, an Opposition that criticizes without initiative, that pulls down without ability to build up, that trembles at every step which means progress, that is frightened at its own shadow when there is something to be done." (Applause.)

Objections to Three Members' Votes.

The leaders of both sides having wound up the debate at 11.30 p.m., it was expected that a division would at once take place, but Mr. Whitney objected, on the ground that it would take so long that the members would miss their street cars home.

Mr. Smith (Sault Ste. Marie) retorted that 300 families in that town had been waiting for weeks for the decision and that they should be considered in preference to the convenience of the Legislature.

Mr. Whitney, rising, said, "I object, Mr. Speaker, to the votes of the hon. member for Port Arthur, the hon. member for North Bruce and the hon. the Provincial Secretary, and I ask your ruling."

The Speaker—The first Lord of the Treasury, Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, on the floor of the British House of Commons, in 1892, stated, in reference to an objection of that sort, that the Government, the Speaker and the Chairmen of Committees always leave these matters for the House to decide.

Mr. Whitney—Is that your ruling?

The Speaker—I give my ruling by stating his words. The question is not for me to decide. It can only be settled by a vote of the House on a substantive motion, which cannot be taken until after the division.

Mr. Hendrie (Hamilton) stated that the firm of which he was a director and also a shareholder had entered into certain contracts with the Algoma Central, and was now in the position of being a creditor of these allied companies. He wished to know from the Speaker whether he had a right to vote on this question. If he had he intended to vote against the bill.

The Speaker, in replying to Mr. Whitney, said that only one name could be challenged at a time. In 1856 objection was raised to some who were alleged to be interested in the Grand Trunk bill, and each name was voted on separately. The rule was that the member whose vote was challenged must retire during the discussion and until after the decision. Common sense must be used, and it was obvious that if twenty or any

other number could be challenged at a time and they were obliged to retire the control of the House might pass into the hands of a minority.

Mr. Whitney and the Speaker.

Mr. Whitney—The statement that such a procedure would throw the control of the House into the hands of the Opposition is a new argument to be used by any speaker of any British Legislature.

The Speaker—I have given my ruling. I have stated the precedents, I have made diligent search in order to be correct, and if my ruling is objected to I appeal to the House.

Mr. Whitney—Oh, well, we propose to appeal to the House, but the time for that has not come.

Mr. Beatty (Leeds) said that he was a contractor for the Algoma Commercial Company, which owed him money which he had paid from his own pocket. If he were permitted to vote he would vote against the bill.

After some further discussion the amendment for a three months' "hoist" was put and lost on a straight party division of 45 yeas and 48 nays.

Mr. Whitney then moved that the votes

just given by James Conmee and C. M. Bowman be disallowed, "they having a direct joint pecuniary interest in the said bill." He proposed, he said, to follow it up with another motion to disallow the vote of Hon. Mr. Stratton, "on the ground that he is a shareholder in the bank which is a creditor." (Cries of "Oh, oh.")

The Premier objected to coupling the names, for the Speaker had already ruled that only one could be challenged at a time.

Hon. Mr. Gibson suggested that the House might adjourn at this stage and listen to-day, on the main motion, to the arguments on the point raised by Mr. Whitney.

The suggestion was adopted and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m.