

He declared that the association for whose benefit this bill was passed was nothing but a combine. He was not to be satisfied with any representations that this was a mere educational bill, for there was, he contended, a combine behind it and this was merely the entering edge of the wedge, which would be driven home in future amendments. This bill, he said, would never have got thus far but for the fact that the Attorney-General had said there was something good in it. He had followed that hon. gentleman for many years and this was the first time he had ever known him to make a wrong step. This brought forth cries of "Order" and "Take care" from the Opposition, who seemed to enjoy this criticism of the leader of the House by one of the staunchest and best of his supporters. Proceeding, Mr. Bishop read a letter from an undertaker in his constituency, declaring that he had been boycotted by the association and had been refused goods because he was not a member of the association. Mr. Bishop expressed surprise at Mr. Tait, whom he called "Toronto's Joseph," the denouncer of combines on the platform, favoring a combine of this kind. He caustically said that in case a man managed to get past the other combines and reach the end of his life with a hundred dollars in his pocket, this was intended to make a combine which would rob him of the money after he was dead. He suggested that to make the thing complete they should have a combine of grave-diggers and tomb-stone planters. Reaching this point in his speech, he looked as if he had much more to say, but the subject seemed too much for his power to express himself, and so he sat down.

Mr. Tait, the promoter of the bill, rose amidst cries of "Lost," "Withdraw," but he was calm and good-natured. He remarked that Mr. Bishop got a speech ready for what he believed the bill would be, and even though it was radically changed he had to get that speech off. The House had listened with pleasure, and now, no doubt, the hon. gentleman would feel better. He went on to tell how the bill had been recast in a conference taken part in by the undertakers who asked for legislation and those who had opposed the original bill, as well as by representatives of labor associations. The measure was now simply an educational one, intended to give the undertakers a means of improving themselves in their business at their own expense.

No sooner had Mr. Tait spoken his last word than the cries of "Withdraw," "Lost," were renewed. The criticism of the bill was renewed, Mr. Cleland contending that the restriction respecting apprentices was undesirable, and Mr. Fraser that several clauses were extraordinary and should not be passed without considerable amendment. Mr. Meredith admitted that certain changes might be made, but wanted the bill to be gone on with. Mr. Balfour moved "That the committee do now rise." This is one of the Parliamentary forms of strangling an infant bill. Mr. Fraser did not plead for the measure, but he represented that the resolution if carried would have the effect of preventing the committee from continuing its sitting for the consideration of other bills. Mr. Balfour reconstructed his resolution so as to get over this difficulty. As put it would not necessarily kill the bill, but it would make it almost impossible at this stage of the session to go on with it effectively.

The House grew merry and boisterous over the measure, and there was a vociferous call for a vote. When Mr. Tait rose there was manifestly a desire to shout him down, but he stood his ground and declared that if the bill was shelved it should be done by resolution, so that the House could take the responsibility. Referring to Mr. Bishop, he reminded that gentleman and the House that the farmers had a college maintained at the public expense, and contrasted this with the demand on the part of the farmers that the undertakers should not be allowed to educate themselves at their own expense.

The vote was taken, resulting in the carrying of Mr. Balfour's amendment, thus practically shelving the measure unless the session lasts longer than any person now expects.

The Medical Act.

Then came on the much-discussed Medical Act amendment bill. This measure is in charge of Dr. McKay, who handled his case this evening with ability which does him infinite credit. The extraordinary clause making one charged with an offence under this act a compellable witness, the doctor contended, related only to cases of medical men to be tried by the Judicial Committee of the council, but when assured by the best lawyers in the House that he was mistaken in thinking that it was thus restricted he agreed to the excision of the clause.

There was a considerable discussion over the clause authorising a fine for non-payment of fees, but Mr. McKay defended it pertinaciously and with ability, convincing the committee at last that the clause should stand. In the course of the discussion Dr. Dack, in a temperate but effective speech, voiced the sentiments of a number of doctors in his own County of Bruce that the profession generally were not sufficiently consulted about amendments to the law sought by the medical council, and that the clause under discussion relating to fees should not pass. Dr. McMahon, on the other hand, spoke ably in defence of the clause.

Hon. Mr. Fraser moved, in order to test the feeling of the committee, that clause eleven of

the bill, which read as follows, be struck out:—

"The said act is further amended by inserting therein the following as section 40a:— (40a) There shall be paid to every registered medical practitioner summoned to attend any court—civil or criminal—for the purpose of giving evidence in his professional capacity or in consequence of professional services rendered by him as a medical practitioner, for each day he so attends, in addition to his travelling expenses, if any, the sum of four dollars (\$4), to be taxed and paid in the manner by law provided with regard to the payment of witnesses attending such court."

Doctors might without any inconvenience attend a court for the purpose of giving evidence, and the same might be said as regards lawyers, but the workmen—carpenters, bricklayers, laborers—were required to go long distances frequently and to sacrifice their day's work in order to give evidence.

Dr. McKay (Oxford) explained that the compensation proposed was for purely professional evidence and not for attendance as an ordinary witness.

In the course of the general discussion which followed it was observed that by this clause the doctor would just be four dollars a day better off than any other witness who gave evidence. Mr. Meredith argued that these professional services should be paid for, and Mr. Awrey took the opposite line. Mr. McCleary cautioned the House to be careful what they did in the way of class legislation, and as for the medical men they were "a parasitic fungus" and deserved no consideration. (Laughter.) This brought up Dr. Jacob Baxter, who regarded the remarks of the previous speaker as altogether out of place. Mr. Fraser remarked at a later stage that the time had come when they should put a stop to this and when all witnesses should be placed upon an equal footing, with the exception of those who were required to render services as experts. After some further debate the clause was struck out. The bill then passed through committee.

Expenses of Appeal.

Several other measures were passed rapidly through committee, but when the House came to an unpretentious little bill of one clause introduced by Mr. Awrey, entitled "An act to reduce the expense of appeals in the Court of Appeal," Mr. Awrey proposed to strike out the only clause and substitute the following for it:—

"In no case where an appeal is brought to the Court of Appeal from a judgment of a County Court, or the judgment, decision or order of a County Court judge, shall any party be required to deliver to the appellate court more than four copies of the appeal book, and the appeal books shall not require to be printed, but they may be made by type-writing, and they shall be in words at length, the pages to be numbered consecutively, and every tenth line of each page shall be numbered in the margin, and shall otherwise be, when type-written, as nearly as may be in the form in which copies of evidence are furnished by shorthand writers for use in the High Court; and the appellant, if costs be awarded to him, shall, for making all the copies of appeal books required to be delivered and served, be entitled to a sum not exceeding at the rate of \$1 for every eight folios of one appeal book."

A discussion was led off by Mr. Meredith, who has evidently a grudge against the typewriters. He declared that their work was frequently not very legible and easily made out and that it was cheaper to get the matter printed. Mr. Awrey failed to see where the cheapness came in, and inquired whether the stenographers did not as a rule get their notes typewritten and then send the type-written copy to the printer. This was admitted to be the practice and there were many members who defended the typewriters from the imputation that their work was not legible. It was generally pronounced good enough for all ordinary purposes. The bill went through committee.

These bills were carried through committee and reported:—

To encourage the breeding of trotting horses—Mr. White.

To amend the Pharmacy Act—Mr. Davis.

To amend the Debenture Registration Act—Mr. Tait.

To amend the Judicature Act—Mr. Meredith.

To amend the Agriculture and Arts Act—Mr. Garrow.

To amend the act respecting companies for steam and heating, or for supplying electricity for light, heat or power—Mr. Biggar.

Respecting stationary engineers—Mr. Tait.

Respecting trust companies—Mr. Meredith.

To provide for the establishment of Mining Schools—Mr. Connee.

Second Readings.

A bill introduced by Mr. Dack to amend the act respecting joint stock companies for supplying cities, towns and villages with gas and water was read the second time. A bill submitted by Mr. Meredith to amend the act to regulate travelling on public highways and bridges also received the second reading.

Bills Withdrawn.

The following bills which stood on the order paper for the second reading were discharged:—

To amend the Public Schools Act—Mr. Barr.

To amend the Municipal Act—Mr. Wood (Brant).