

Mr. Graham thought it strange that the city should desire to treat a hotel scheme with more leniency than they would an industry that brought with it hundreds of workmen.

Mr. Pyne read extracts from reports of the Assessment Commissioner to the effect that property in the neighborhood of the proposed hotel was decreasing in value, and that the erection of the building would undoubtedly have the effect of increasing the values.

Mr. Dryden in Favor.

Hon. Mr. Dryden did not agree with his hon. friend the Minister of Education. He believed the city could do nothing that would give a greater impetus to its interests than to aid this new hotel. If he were a citizen of Toronto he would hold up both hands in support of the proposal to aid the enterprise.

Mr. Marter spoke strongly in favor of the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Ross reiterated his objections.

Mr. McKay said that if Mr. Foy would consent to strike out the power asked for in regard to water rates he would vote for the bill.

Mr. Foy consented to this.

Mr. Conmee thought the proposal should first have the sanction of the ratepayers.

Mr. Miscampbell favored the project.

A standing vote was taken, with the result that 50 voted for and 33 against the amendment. Hon. Mr. Ross, however, pointed out that the House not being in committee, the vote was irregular.

The members were thereupon called in and a division taken, resulting in the carrying of the amendment by 45 to 33.

The division was as follows:—

Yeas—Allen, Barber, Barr, Beatty (Leeds), Blezard, Boyd, Brower, Burt, Carnegie, Colquhoun, Crawford, Dryden, Duff, Eilber, Fallis, Farwell, Foy, Fox, Gallagher, Garrow, Hill, Hodgins, Jamieson, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Little, Lucas, Malcolm, Marter, Matheson, Miscampbell, Monteith, Morrison, McDonald, McKay, McLaughlin, Powell, Pyne, Reid (Durham), Taylor, Thompson, Wardell, White, Whitney—45.

Nays—Auld, Aylesworth, Beatty (Parry Sound), Bowman, Bridgland, Brown, Caldwell, Charlton, Conmee, Davis, Dickenson, Douglas, Ferguson, German, Gibson, Graham, Guibord, Harcourt, Harty, Hislop, Holmes, Lumsden, Mutrie, Macnish, McKee, Pardee, Pardo, Pattullo, Pettypiece, Ross, Stratton, Truax, Tucker—33.

The absentees were Hon. Mr. Hardy, Messrs. Campbell, Carpenter, Carscalen, Clarke, Dempsey, Hoyle, Kribs, Leys, Loughrin, Reid (Addington), Russell, Richardson, Smith.

The bill then passed its third reading.

The Fisheries Bill.

On resuming at 3.30 o'clock the House went into committee on the fisheries bill.

Mr. Thompson pointed out that the effect of section five would be to prevent persons from angling for sale without taking out a license. That, he thought, was undesirable, and would operate harshly upon the poorer fishermen.

Hon. Mr. Hardy concurred in the undesirability of such a provision, and it was ordered to be struck out.

Section 16 reads: "No person shall offer or expose for sale any bass less than ten inches in length, or any whitefish, salmon trout or lake trout weighing less than two pounds undressed.

Mr. Thompson suggested that the catching of bass be prohibited altogether.

Hon. Mr. Hardy said they could not go that far. The object of the section was to prevent bass and the other fish enumerated being caught with a net.

The section requiring each lessee or licensee at the end of each fishing to transmit to the fishery overseer of the district a statement showing the amount in weight of each of the different kinds of fish caught by him, and the price per pound received for the same, was amended by making it applicable only to fish caught for commercial purposes.

Clauses seventeen and twenty were struck out. They read: "No common carrier or other person shall ship or transport out of this Province, or have in possession for the purpose of shipping or transporting out of this Province, any speckled trout (brook trout), bass or maskinonge, before the 1st of January, 1904. No person not holding a license shall take, catch or kill by angling more than five salmon or lake trout in any one day; and where two or more persons are angling from the same boat, the aggregate number of said trout taken, caught or killed in any one day shall not exceed ten."

The bill was reported as amended.

General Revenue Bill.

Mr. Harcourt moved the third reading of the bill (165) to supplement the revenues of the Province.

Mr. Whitney moved the six months' hoist. The Opposition, he said, took the position that, as they had foretold

from year to year, the Province now found itself face to face with and had adopted direct taxation. The passage of the measure would mark a strange, solemn epoch in the history of the Province. When the people of the Province began to understand that for the first time they were face to face with direct taxation they would more seriously consider the question of Provincial administration, and would then be led to conclude that for years past they had been deceived with regard to its finances. The Opposition would be in a position to say "we told you so; we told you what the truth was; but you did not believe, while our political enemies sneered and ridiculed us when we brought the charge against them in the House." The political enemies of the Opposition had, continued Mr. Whitney, now afforded them indisputable proof of their assertions that the surplus did not exist. He believed that the members of the House would do well to reject the bill.

Mr. Matheson said that the reason given for the imposition of the taxation was an estimated deficiency caused by the prohibition of export of logs. The deficiency last year in the Crown Lands Department was only \$75,000, yet against this the Government proposed to raise some two or three hundred thousand dollars. The reason now advanced for putting on the taxation