

port in any constituency, with the exception, perhaps, of some of the large cities. He again challenged the hon. member to point out the amalgamation clause in the bill, and said there was no such clause in the bill. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) There was a clause which said that the Companies might work together for twenty-one years, but there was no provision for amalgamation. If hon. members would look to the Statute-book they would find that amalgamation had been provided for by the Legislature, and had been in operation for the past sixteen years. As to the interests of the Town of Brantford, if he thought they would be injuriously affected by the bill, he should consider it his duty as its representative to vote against the bill, but he feared no such result.

Mr. STREET said every member of the House was well aware of the power of amalgamation which existed in the Statutes, and he did not see why these companies could not have made their arrangement under the existing law, without troubling this House for new powers. He was not afraid of the great power of the Grand Trunk Company which had been spoken of, and he should be sorry to see any misfortune befall it, but he did not wish to permit other railway interests to be injured by combinations of the kind which they were now called upon to consider. The hon. member for Brant had urged the passage of the bill, because there was a clause in it to enable the Grand Trunk Company to raise money to build the International Bridge. But did anybody believe that the Grand Trunk could find the means for carrying out every enterprise in the country? The International Bridge Company meant to raise the means themselves, and would no doubt succeed in building their bridge, but their name was only used in this bill as a blind to help to carry it through this House. If the Company could raise money he desired to see it expended in completing and improving their own property, and he should be sorry to see it saddled with another undertaking which would further draw upon its means. It was not as a question of interest to one company or the other, but to that of the people at large, that they as the people's representatives should look, and he contended that the best way to serve the people's interest was to leave the several railways precisely as they are, and allow each to work out its own fortune by its own means. He hoped the bill would be rejected on the second reading.

Hon. G. BROWN said the hon. member for Ontario had pressed very strongly the point that amalgamation had been provided for already by statute, and could not be objected to in this bill, whereas the hon. member for Brant denied that there was any amalgamation between the companies.

Mr. WOOD—said not in the bill.

Hon. G. BROWN read a clause showing that the act vested all the rights and powers of the Buffalo and Lake Huron company in the Grand Trunk company, and it that was not amalgamation he knew not what it was. The act clearly authorised an agreement between the two companies which gave one of them the whole control of the other for a period of no less than a thousand years, and surely that was equivalent to amalgamation. He had been exceedingly surprised to hear the hon. member from Huron and Bruce speaking in favor of this bill, for he had been one of its most strenuous opponents. Then, again, that hon. gentleman had said the people of these counties were not opposed to the principle of amalgamation, when there was before the House a petition from the United Counties' Council of Huron and Bruce, which the hon. member himself had presented, which strongly objected to the passage of the bill. The people of Brantford were also said to be in favor of the bill, but it was in a very particular way—provided they could make a profit out of the money which they had borrowed out of the Municipal Loan fund. With regard to the principle of railway amalgamation, he did not care whether it was on the statute-book or not, it was a bad principle and ought to be abolished at once.

Mr. FERGUSSON (South Simcoe) said that to his knowledge, no attempt had ever been made to amalgamate the Northern with the Grand Trunk. Another charge that had been made against the Grand Trunk was, that it had interfered with municipal as well as parliamentary elections. Now, in fact, it had been seen that along the line of the Grand Trunk, opponents to that Company had been returned—at Cornwall, Brockville and Toronto. As to the present arrangement of the Grand Trunk with the Buffalo and Lake Huron road, he had been assured by many of the constituents of his hon. friend, who had moved the six months' hoist, that their interests were much better served now than they ever had been by the Buffalo road before the amalgamation had taken place. He (Mr. F.) knew the wants of his hon. friend's constituents, better than that hon. member did himself. All the stations

north of Stratford profited largely by the arrangement; they were making now 10 cents a barrel on flour more than they did before, and they would not thank their member for trying to wrest these ten cents from them.

Mr. McFARLANE asked how was that the case.

Mr. FERGUSSON—Because, since the amalgamation, as everybody knew, the charge for the transhipment had been abolished. As to the general subject of amalgamation—already several companies had been amalgamated and no injurious results had yet taken place. He trusted that the Ottawa and Prescott Company would enter into some arrangement with the Grand Trunk, so that the travelling community might not be detained four hours at Prescott. (Hear, hear.) He had also been very much surprised to hear the member for North Wellington speak as he did, on the subject of amalgamation. He had always considered that hon. member consistent in his views, but he thought he had been very inconsistent to-night, and would have been very much at a loss to know the reason of his conduct had he not heard that his friend had got a new office; he was now a Director in the Great Western Railway, (laughter) and therefore he must come here to speak against the Grand Trunk. The hon. member for South Oxford had also been very friendly with that Company, if not a Director he had been a contractor.

Mr. BROWN denied it.

Mr. FERGUSSON continued to explain the advantages the Grand Trunk conferred on the country, and the benefit to parties shipping produce on the line of the Buffalo and Lake Huron, by being relieved of the charge for transhipment, since the arrangement between the two companies came into force.

Hon. A. T. GALT would like to ask gentlemen opposed to this bill, into what position do they wish to throw the Buffalo and Lake Huron road? Do they wish to throw it back to the condition in which it was before the arrangement was made, a condition of insolvency? If they mean anything, they must mean that that road should be made insolvent and sold to the highest bidder. There was no new principle involved in the bill, which had passed a second reading in this House last year, with the consent of the hon. member for South Oxford, who was then on his side of the House. At that time hon. members on the opposite side had no reason to oppose the second reading of the bill; they allowed it to pass and go before the railway committee. It was carried through that committee and brought back to the House, though now they refused it even a second reading. This was not the time to discuss the principle of the bill, it was the practice always to send private bills to a Committee, and afterwards to discuss the principle when they came up for a third reading.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD said the position of the Buffalo and Lake Huron had been in such a position that it must fall either into the hands of the Great Western or of the Grand Trunk. The Great Western was more of an American Company; it gave a daylight passage to travellers and freight from one point in the States to another, whereas the Grand Trunk was essentially a Canadian road, and so far had his sympathy, but he confessed it had not been worked to the satisfaction of the country. It had enjoyed great power over the Government of the country, every Ministry had been its friend, his own had even tried to do something for it. (Laughter.) He would follow the same course this session as he had done with regard to the amalgamation bill he once introduced himself, allow the bill to go before the Railway Committee to have its errors corrected and its objectionable features exchanged.

Col. HAULTAIN addressed the House against the second reading.

Mr. GIBBS spoke in favor of the second reading. He argued that there was a struggle between the Great Western and the Grand Trunk, as to which of them should get possession of the Buffalo and Lake Huron road, and that it was the interest of Canada that the Grand Trunk should get it. (Hear.)

The members were then called in, and the vote taken, when the amendment was lost.—Yeas, 44. Nays, 66.

Mr. Morris did not vote, having paired with the member for Argenteuil.

The bill was read a second time, on the same division.

The following bills were also read a second time:

To amend the Act to amend and consolidate the provisions contained in the Acts and Ordinances relating to the incorporation of and the supply of water in the City of Quebec.—Hon. Mr. Cauchon.

To amend the Act incorporating the Quebec Marine Insurance Company.—Hon. Mr. Allyn.

On motion of Hon. Mr. CAMERON the House went into Committee on the bill to incor-

porate the Canada Vine Growers' Association. Committee rose and reported the bill.

Mr. DICKSON'S bill to legalise By-Law No. 7, appropriating a certain sum of money for the construction of certain roads and harbors in the County of Bruce was read a second time.

On the motion for the second reading of Hon. Mr. CAMERON'S bill, "To provide for the sale of the Rectory Lands of this Province," a long discussion took place, Hon. Gen. Brown opposing, and Hon. J. A. Macdonald and J. H. Cameron, and Messrs. Dunkin, Fergusson (S. Simcoe), Irvine and others supporting it.

Hon. Mr. BROWN moved the three months' hoist.—Lost.

Yeas, Messrs. Brown, McKellar and McKelvie. Nays, 77.

The bill was read a second time on the same division.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked the Minister of Finance when the House might expect the report of the Trade Commission.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL replied that the matter was now in the hands of the printer, and would be brought in as soon as possible.

In reply to Mr. Holton, Hon. Mr. GALT said the education bill was in a forward state of preparation, and would be submitted at an early day.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD addressed the House on the subject of the recent calamitous fire at Portland, and suggested that the House should express its sympathy with the sufferers in some marked and formal manner.

Hon. J. A. MACDONALD agreed with the hon. member, that it was the duty of every one to sympathize with the sufferers.

A few unopposed private bills were read a second time, and the House adjourned at half-past 12 o'clock.

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, July 10th, 1866.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

After routine.

Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU brought in a return to an Address to His Excellency praying for a statement of the whole cost of the Public Buildings to date; of the amount necessary for their completion and for furniture; for levelling and embellishing the grounds; for lighting, heating, wages and maintenance.

On motion of Hon. Mr. AIKINS, a Select Committee was appointed to consider the amending of the Upper Canada Municipality Act, said Committee to consist of Hon. Messrs. Barnham, Christie, Vidal, Reesor, Blake, Currie, Flint and the mover.

The order for the third reading of the Belleville Cemetery Act being called.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he would suggest to the hon. member who had it in charge (Hon. Mr. Flint) to allow it to be referred to the Committee of the whole House for the purpose of amending it, as provided in the general law respecting burial places, viz. to protect the property from seizure for tax or debt of the parties owning the lots.

Hon. Mr. Flint was obliged to the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands for the suggestion, and moved that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole to-morrow.—Carried.

The following Bills were then read a third time and passed:

Bill to charter the Belleville and Marmora Railway.

Bill to amend the Act of the Savings Bank of Notre Dame de Quebec.

Bill to ascertain the proprietorship of the Commons of Berthier and Isle du Pads.

On motion of Hon. Mr. FERRIER, the Bill to enable the Trustees of the Wesleyan Methodist Queen Street Church property, Toronto, to put the same under the English Model Trust Deed, was then read a second time and referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON (Kingston), from the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, reported the Bill to amend the charter of the Bank of Upper Canada, with amendments.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN explained that the Bill as brought before the House, contemplated: 1st. The reduction of the capital. 2nd. The issue of preferential shares. 3rd. A change in the qualification of the Directors, but the Committee had dropped the 2nd clause and provided that before the proposed reduction in the capital stock took place, a notice of 60 days should be given to all stockholders.

The amendments were then concurred in, and the Bill was ordered for a third reading to-morrow.

The House then adjourned.