

Why, Sir, every man had a railway Bill, but to the honor of the hon. member for East Elgin, he did not support those appropriations. They spent that money, and they were not satisfied with the amount of money that had been voted, but they mortgaged the Province of Ontario for twenty years for \$100,000 a year; and, as I said the other night, they had to borrow money last year to pay some of those loans. They had to sell annuities in order to get money to meet this expenditure. I was told by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) that we had the greatest Government in the Dominion in the Province of Ontario. He may be in love with that Government, but I do not think the people of Ontario will show any love for it long. That hon. gentleman ventured to adopt the role of a prophet and prophesied that we would not come back to this House unless we supported this motion. I should think that a young member of this House, no matter how able he might be, ought to hesitate before adopting that role. I venture to say that if I want to come back to Parliament, my vote on this question will not only not prevent my return but will assist it. I venture to say that the people will endorse the stand I take, when I say that we should not allow 162 municipalities to rob 591. That is the position I take, I say that in this matter we have a duty to perform towards the whole Dominion as well as to the municipalities, and we must not shirk performing that duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that I am very much like my hon. friend from Hastings; they say I would like to do away with Local Governments altogether. I have never expressed any such opinion in the country, but I say that if the different Local Legislatures decide, if it should be the wish of the people that we should have legislative union, it would be a question for them to consider. I hope we have had enough of these parish politics, I hope this discussion will finish tonight, and I am satisfied this resolution will turn out to be a boomerang that will rebound to those who throw it; I am certain that when this question is put to the people of Ontario they will not take the stand expected by hon. gentlemen opposite. I protest against the Dominion giving the municipalities assistance in this shape because to do so, they will require to rob the other municipalities, and I will continue to protest against any such course being adopted until I hear better arguments for it than have been advanced so far.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to correct the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) in his statement that the riding I have the honor to represent borrowed the sum of \$140,000, and that we obtained the money from the Municipal Loan Fund. I have the satisfaction to tell the hon. gentleman that we did not get a single dollar from the Municipal Loan Fund, either that time or subsequently, having borrowed the money from a loan society, and, unlike some other municipalities, we paid every dollar we borrowed; we borrowed it from private sources and were called to pay the principal and interest when they became due, so that the statement that we had borrowed our money from the Municipal Loan Fund was utterly incorrect.

Mr. McCALLUM. I did not say you did; I said it was paid from the Municipal Loan Fund.

Mr. WILSON. I accept the hon. gentleman's denial, but I must say I took his statement down and am quoting him correctly. If he says we received the amount we expended on the construction of the road from the Municipal Loan Fund, he is as far in error in that statement as he was in the one I charged him with. He ought to know that none of the municipalities, even those that borrowed from the Municipal Loan Fund, received more than \$2 per capita and a certain consideration on account of the money

Mr. McCALLUM.

they had expended on railways. Further, he says that we ought to have but very little to say in the matter, because in the county I represent we have been greatly benefited by the railway, that we are in an enviable position, having splendid railway facilities, and that St. Thomas is now a city when a few years ago it was but a small village. Well, if we are in that position, we gained it by the energy and devotion of our people to the interests of their county. They were not, perhaps, like the people of the constituency he represents, anxious to hoard up their funds and expend but a small pittance, some \$20,000, to improve their locality. The hon. gentleman is the last man who should say he was bold enough and would dare to vote against doing justice to the people of Ontario. I have not a Government at my back as he has which would readily gerrymander a constituency for me and make my seat safe in the future; but on the contrary, I represent a constituency that has been gerrymandered in the interests of my opponent and to keep me out of the position I have the honor to occupy. The hon. gentleman referred to the amount of money expended on the Welland Canal. No one in that part of the country, from one end of Welland Canal to the other, knows better than the hon. gentleman what money has been expended in opening up the Welland Canal. Further, he states that I, while a member of the Local Legislature, opposed railway grants, which I admit, and I did so on the same principle and for the same cause which leads me to oppose them now. The hon. gentleman gave the whole of his party away in saying that in the Local Legislature grants to railways were brought down—for what purpose? For a purpose I would hesitate to mention in addressing members of a Legislature—for the purpose of corruptly influencing their votes. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the resolutions brought in here last Session were brought in for this purpose? If he applies such a charge to the members of the Local Legislature he must give it equal application to the members of this House. Had the railway resolutions introduced here last Session the effect of corrupting members of this Legislature and inducing them to vote for grants they would not otherwise support. I do not wish to apply the charge made by the hon. member to the representatives and supporters of the Reform Government of Ontario, to hon. members of this House. I could hardly believe that they would be induced to record their votes, under these circumstances, in any way other than what they conceived to be in the best interests of the Dominion, but we may have seen votes recorded which, if the resolutions had been brought down individually, might have been recorded differently, but I as an individual have always believed, and still believe it, to be a vicious principle, that any Legislature should be asked to vote in reference to a large number of railways at one time. The system adopted by the Local Legislature was far superior to the system adopted here. Each Order in Council was brought down, the papers in connection with the railway which was to receive aid were printed and laid on the table of each member, so that he might have an opportunity of looking over them and coming to a correct conclusion as to whether he considered that the road should or should not receive aid. Here we had nothing but a resolution presented to the House, we had no opportunity of forming a conclusion whether the roads proposed to be aided were entitled to aid or not, whether they were in the general interest or not. I therefore say that the system proposed to this House in 1883 was, in my opinion, a very vicious system, and it was not only proposed in 1883 but followed up last Session, and if we are to have each and every Session resolutions of this kind proposing aid to various and sundry railways, I fear that some members of this Legislature may at times be compelled to record