

for ten years, and that the total liability for Toronto be placed at \$60,000.

Mr. Crawford pointed out that the Don improvements would not be of any use unless a swing bridge were built. Further, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council would likely require the city to build such a bridge.

Mr. Pattullo, North Oxford, claimed that the extension of the reduction in taxation to other soap companies would be a gross injustice to manufacturers in the same line of business in other parts of the Province.

Mr. James Scott objected to any compromise exempting other manufacturers. Let the agreement be dealt with on its merits.

Mr. Pattullo moved that the agreement be considered without reference to other manufacturers and this was concurred in.

The Agreement Passed.

The agreement was then ratified, with the understanding that the expenditure upon dredging and piling and other works should not exceed \$60,000, and that the expenditure for keeping the Don channel open should not exceed \$1,500 annually.

The committee refused to give permission to use part of Stanley Park, between King street and Wellington avenue, as a cattle market and the clause was withdrawn.

Other Powers Sought.

The clauses in the city's bill relating to the Laidlaw letters, the Gas Company's plant, buildings and renewal fund, proposed penalties for violations by the Street Railway Company of their agreement, the development of electric energy by the city and the issue of \$50,000 worth of debentures for St. Lawrence Market building, stood over until to-day.

The committee refused by a vote of 18 to 9 to give the city the right to empower any other company to lay down new lines and to extend the existing services, or to undertake such works itself, provided there were neglect or refusal on the part of the Toronto Street Railway Company. The vote stood:—Yeas—Crawford, Dempsey, Fallis, Foy, Geyman, Jessop, Marter, Miscampbell, Reid (Durham)—9.

Nays—Auld, Barber, Carscallen, Colquhoun, Conmee, Farwell, Fox, Graham, Guibord, Hill, Hoyle, McKay, McGee, Pattullo, Russell, Smith, Thompson, White—18.

Mr. S. H. Blake, Q.C., on behalf of the company, argued that the power asked for would destroy the company's franchise. He represented \$3,000,000 of debenture holders in Great Britain, who had advanced their money on the strength that the franchise would not be interfered with.

Messrs. Barber, Conmee and Pattullo supported Mr. Blake's view, while Toronto's representatives strongly contended that the city should be placed in a position to compel the company to improve and extend its service.

Mr. Blake denied that the company had refused to extend its service, and Mr. Fullerton then referred to the Gerard street bridge and York street

bridge as two specific instances. Thereupon counsel for the Street Car Company said his clients were willing to extend across York street, but had been threatened by the railways with an injunction if they did so.