

incorporated villages could do, was read a second time, though Mr. Hardy remarked that at so late a period it was almost impossible to deal with further amendments to the municipal act. A second bill by Mr. Dack to amend the assessment act was withdrawn, in view of the argument advanced by Mr. Hardy.

Mr. Hardy moved the second reading of his bill to amend the municipal act by giving municipalities power to set apart portions of streets for boulevards, and to fence and protect the same. Mr. Meredith said he hoped it was not intended to deprive the public of any portions of the highways. The bill was sent to the Municipal Committee.

Mr. Tait moved the discharge of his bill limiting work on Saturday on contracts and other works, and in shops, factories and other places of business. He said that it had been represented to him that there were various ways of achieving the desired end without new legislation, such as, for instance, by the application of the Lord's Day act, and in other ways. He had therefore concluded not to press the bill.

Mr. Hardy's bill to amend the municipal act by enabling Boards of Police Commissioners to appoint a Chairman was read a second time. Mr. Meredith said he thought there was no necessity for such boards electing a Chairman, or that such Chairman should have any particular powers over any other member. He thought, however, there might be with some advantage an increased representation of the people upon the board.

THE AQUEDUCT BILL.

The House then took up Dr. Gilmour's private bill to incorporate the Georgian Bay Ship Canal & Power Aqueduct Company. The bill occasioned a very interesting discussion. The Commissioner of Public Works, who had apparently been waiting all the afternoon until this order was called, led the attack on the bill. He characterized the canal portion of the scheme outlined in the bill as nothing but a South Sea bubble. For the purposes of the construction of the aqueduct the bill proposed to invest the company with enormous powers. It gave an actual monopoly of water power and water fall over a large section of the Province. There was danger, he said, of the bill resulting in the creation of a great corporation on this side monopolizing as much in its way as the Standard Oil Company had done on the

other side. He did not feel well enough to discuss the subject very much, but he thought it right to warn the House of what he considered to be the dangerous nature of the bill. The company, by the passage of this bill, would be invested with a monopoly of enormous privileges over the territory affected by it. It was true that the company could not enter the city without the consent of the City Council, and that the company would not have the right to expropriate without the consent of the Councils respectively of York and Simcoe; but it was well known how these things were manipulated. It might be worth while spending a large amount of money to get these privileges from the bodies named. He knew of no company in the Dominion with such enormous powers as it was proposed to give this company.

Mr. E. F. Clarke said he thought the majority of the Aldermen of Toronto, both last year and this year, were in favor of the bill so long as the interests of the city were safeguarded. He agreed entirely, however, that the interests of the public should be properly guarded. He was willing to support a motion that the bill should be amended by having inserted a provision that the sanction of the House must be secured before the City or County Councils could give the powers in question.

Mr. Fraser said the city's only safeguard was in its own hands. The company could tie up everything around Toronto.

Mr. Gibson said Mr. Clarke realized that a large number of his constituents favored the bill. He went on to say that he (Mr. Gibson) had thrown cold water on the bill in committee, but without much encouragement. Numerous deputations had appeared before him in support of it. There was no disposition on the part of any members of the committee to throw the bill out. The Solicitor of Toronto was there. At his instance amendments were inserted, and he had himself caused the insertion of others, and he had now two or three more which he wanted to insert. There was no responsibility for the bill or its provisions resting on the Chairman. As to the powers it gave, he was not prepared to go the length of the Commissioner of Public Works, but the bill certainly contained very large powers. He could not agree with the Commissioner, however, that it was a South Sea bubble scheme.

Mr. Fraser observed that he had applied this term only to the canal portion of the scheme.

Mr. Gibson said he did not know how this might be but if the aqueduct was

once completed others would follow, and it was not unreasonable to suppose that it would be so. He had not heard it suggested anywhere that it would be anything of a calamity to have such an aqueduct built as was suggested. He did not know of any other machinery to undertake the construction of this work than that of an incorporated company. Undoubtedly, such an aqueduct would give immense water power and an almost inexhaustible electric power. He thought it would be a great boon to the city; that is, it would be a boon if the committee had anything to say as to the rates at which the power would be distributed. That matter had been left in the hands of the city. He thought, also, it would be an advantage to the city to have the pure water of Lake Simcoe brought here. He supposed that would be one of the adjuncts of this aqueduct. He thought there was no good reason why Toronto should not desire to have this work carried out. The whole point of the bill appeared to him to be the question as to whether or not the bill was a bona fide bill. If it was intended to make any improper use of the charter, which he did not believe, the committee would have done better to have rejected the bill. He had impressed this upon the committee. He contended that any trouble arising from the bill in future would not be blamable upon him as Chairman of the Private Bills Committee. The safeguards suggested by those most interested were all inserted, and no safeguard that was suggested was rejected.

Mr. Fraser, speaking again for a moment, said none of the municipalities along the line of the aqueduct proposed had any safeguards other than the vote of the County Council. The company could override the wishes of a local municipality practically. He had done his duty by pointing out the danger of the bill. The Legislature would be responsible. When the time came for dealing with it he would not be here. His responsibility would have ceased.

It being 6 o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

When the House re-assembled Hon. Mr. Hardy called attention to a misrepresentation which appeared in The News, to the effect that he had "snubbed Dr. Gilmour" in the Municipal Committee, over the doctor's bill regarding the return of bonuses which are not utilized for the purpose for which they are voted. The account was absolutely untrue, he said. Dr. Gilmour added that he had been out of the building at the moment when he had been described by The News as quitting the committee room in disgust at the Chairman's action. The aqueduct bill was again taken up. Mr. Meredith asked Dr. Gilmour as to the exact course which the canal would take. Dr. Gilmour replied that either the Humber or the Don must be used, but the expense of ascertaining the exact route had not as yet been incurred. Mr. Meredith then uttered a strong protest against the charter being granted with such vague powers. Hon. Mr. Fraser was very emphatic in his condemnation of the bill. The provisions of the bill as to the spending of a certain sum of money upon the work in a certain time were illusory and could be evaded, while the absence of definite points of departure and a definite route were equally dangerous. No railway would be given a charter that would allow it to go straggling all over the country. He was inclined to think that the expropriation powers were what the promoters were after.

Hon. Mr. Gibson defended the bill, and asked why the hon. gentlemen had not gone to the Private Bills Committee and opposed it there. If they were determined to attack it let them do it at the third reading and in a full House, and not in a slimly-attended committee. He touched upon the nature of the scheme, and contended that it was hardly fair to say that it was necessarily an impracticable scheme, and urged that it should at all events be passed through this stage.

Mr. Meredith contended that the company had not complied with all the conditions as to plans and maps. Hon. Mr. Fraser again claimed that the company had not really bound itself to do anything. Mr. Conmee befriended the bill, saying he could see nothing extraordinary in the powers given. Mr. E. J. Davis urged that the bill be rendered safe rather than killed. Some discussion arose on the point which Mr. Meredith raised, as to whether the company had complied with the formalities demanded by the rules of the House. The Chairman finally ruled that the question was not before the committee. The bill was then discussed clause by clause. Mr. Fraser, supported by Mr. Meredith, tried to get an amendment inserted into the second clause by which all towns and townships on the