

garded \$65,000,000 as a very large sum. It was an easy matter to get the capital increased if it were found necessary.

The amendment was carried, and other clauses, where necessary, were changed correspondingly.

Hon. Mr. Fraser moved an amendment, the effect of which would be to make the consent of every municipality necessary to any expropriation of land within its limits necessary for the construction of the aqueduct instead of the County Council giving the power, as the bill originally provided.

Mr. Tait said this would greatly increase the work put upon the company before it could commence operations, and the period of six months allowed for beginning the enterprise should therefore be extended.

Mr. Meredith agreed that municipalities should have the right advocated in the amendment.

Mr. Whitney said if the bill was put through the House it recognized the possibility of the scheme going through. It should not, therefore, be killed by having a municipality given power to block it.

Hon. Mr. Gibson said the promoters of the bill argued that this power would enable a minor municipality to block the whole scheme. There might be no difficulty, in nine cases out of ten, in getting the consent of the municipality; the tenth might cause grievous difficulty.

Mr. Meredith said that in that case the matter might be dealt with by special legislation.

Hon. Mr. Fraser said he had no objection to the matter being left in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Dr. Gilmour held that the fact that the counties through which the canal will pass had, through their Councils, expressed a hope that this clause would not pass, should have some effect upon the committee.

Mr. A. F. Wood pointed out that, while the aqueduct was a private enterprise, the canal was a public project.

Mr. Tait held this to be a somewhat unfair distinction.

The amendment was lost, the Attorney-General and Mr. Meredith supporting Mr. Fraser.

Hon. Mr. Fraser then moved another amendment, that the company be allowed powers for canal purposes only after obtaining each municipality's consent. This was also defeated.

Mr. E. F. Clarke moved that before any contracts can be made with any municipality the company must exhibit plans and surveys of its proposed route.

Hon. Mr. Gibson declared that this was a blow at the company which would seriously injure it.

Mr. Meredith argued strongly against the company being given such a roving character.

Mr. Tait thought that the city could be left, to some extent, to look after itself. If the city wished to contract for cheap light and heat it would be unjust to oblige the company, which was to sell those articles, to show its surveys and course.

Some further discussion took place and the amendment was defeated.

Hon. Mr. Fraser moved in amendment to a subsequent clause to give municipalities individually the right to decide whether or not the aqueduct or canal may enter its limits, and in case of refusal to leave the matter to the decision of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. This amendment was carried by a small majority. The bill went through without further amendment, and the committee reported it.

THE GAS PIPE BILL.

When Mr. O'Connor's bill to remove doubts as to the assessment of gas pipes and the wires of companies upon the public streets came up for a third reading Mr. Balfour moved that the bill should not become law in any municipality until such municipality had by by-law decided to adopt the principle of the bill. Mr. Balfour pointed out that in this way a municipality would have the right of using its own discretion as to taxing these companies.

The Attorney-General said that the amendment would be more in accord with what he thought should be the case if it were added that no municipality which had previously made a contract with an electric or gas company in which exemption from taxation was specified should pass a by-law taxing the company.

A somewhat tangled discussion followed, in which various amendments on this head were suggested by the Attorney-General, Mr. Guthrie and others. At length, on the suggestion of Mr. Clancy, the bill was allowed to stand until the afternoon, that the point under discussion might be considered meanwhile.

A number of bills were then read a third time without debate. Those thus disposed of were the Attorney-General's bill respecting the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park, Hon. Mr. Harcourt's bill to make further provision respecting voters' lists, Mr. Godwin's bill amending the High Schools act, Hon. Mr. Gibson's bill respecting benefit societies, and four legal bills of the Attorney-General's—respecting

High Court sittings in the County of York, respecting companies licensed under the revised statutes authorizing corporations and institutions incorporated out of Ontario to lend money and invest therein, to correct a clerical error in the schedule to last year's act respecting Sheriffs, and to make further provision respecting mortgages of real estate. Under the head of second readings Mr. Bush's bill amending the act providing against fraud in the supplying of milk to cheese and butter factories was passed, while Mr. Field's bill amending the births, marriages and deaths act, Mr. Cleland's bill to amend the game laws, and Mr. Balfour's natural gas bill were withdrawn. Mr. Conmee's Separate Schools bill and Mr. Harty's bill to amend the act regulating travel on highways and bridges were passed through committee. It was agreed in connection with Hon. Mr. Harcourt's bill regarding voters' lists that the bill providing for the transfer of voters' names from one electoral district to another in certain cases should be dropped.

THE FEE COMMISSION.

On behalf of Mr. Ryerson, Mr. Whitney asked if Mr. Thomas Brooke had been appointed as one of the members of the Fee Commission, and, if so, if he had accepted the office and was now acting.

The Attorney-General said Mr. Brooke had been appointed, and had accepted. He had not commenced his duties immediately because of an accident, a broken leg, but he had been acting now for some days.

FLOUR IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. Hammell asked: Is the flour now supplied to the public institutions of the Province manufactured from wheat grown in the Province of Ontario, or is the "strong baker's" manufactured from Manitoba wheat used and demanded in the contract?

Hon. Mr. Ross replied that "strong baker's" or "Manitoba" wheat was not demanded in the specifications or tenders. The flour required might be made from any wheat producing flour satisfactory in strength and color. The color and strength of the flour were approved by sample submitted with each tender, and accepted or rejected without regard to where the wheat might be produced.

It being 1 o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

When the House resumed its sittings at 3 o'clock the Attorney-General's bill to amend the local administration of justice in certain cases came up for its third reading. This was the decentralization bill, and Mr. Meredith moved that the bill be referred back to committee of the whole, with instructions to amend the same so as to extend the provisions of the bill to all cases where the proceedings were begun and were carried on at Ottawa or London, and the solicitor for the party moving resided there. There was no discussion on the amendment, and a division was taken, with the result that the amendment was defeated by a vote of 40 to 25.

MR. O'CONNOR'S BILL.

The third reading of Mr. O'Connor's bill for the exemption of gas mains, etc., was then taken up again.

Mr. Balfour again moved his amendment, which was submitted in a modified form. It was to the effect that the act should not become operative in any municipality until a by-law to that effect had been passed, but that such by-law could not be passed until after the expiry of any agreement or contract between the municipality and any company affected by the bill.

Mr. Whitney said he would accept any reasonable compromise, but did not regard this as reasonable. In the case of many small municipalities there may have been no contracts, but there was a distinct understanding at the time engagements were entered into in these municipalities that they should not be assessable.

Mr. Tait said the amendment would leave an injustice in the case of Toronto, where the city had contracts with some companies and not with others.

Mr. E. F. Clarke said this would not last long, as the contracts had not long to run.

Mr. Guthrie would rather have had the bill without the amendment, but in view of all the circumstances he was prepared to accept it.

Mr. Garrow thought it a mistake to add such a clause to the bill.

Mr. Whitney asked what the law would be under the bill in municipalities where a contract did not exist.

The Attorney-General said it would be as the bill made it.

The amendment was then voted on and carried by 24 to 32, the Government being supported by Mr. Meredith, and the two sides of the House being generally split up.

Mr. Garrow then said Mr. O'Connor, the supporter of the bill, had been obliged to leave the city, and had asked him to take charge of it. He had suggested to him that if the House should change its opinion on this subject, as he had some idea it