

St. Catharine's Powers.

In the Legislature this morning an amendment was made to the bill enabling the City of St. Catharines to acquire water privileges. This provided that in the event of the Town of Merritton disposing of water privileges, the consent of at least two-thirds of the Council must be had. A second amendment provided that property acquired by the Corporation of St. Catharines in Merritton should be subject to assessment in the same manner as other property. The bill was then read a third time and passed.

The Lever Agreement.

Mr. Marter moved the third reading of the bill confirming the agreement between the City of Toronto and the Lever Brothers.

Mr. Barber (Halton) moved in amendment that the bill be referred back to committee in order to provide that the other soap manufacturers of Toronto should receive an exemption of assessment pro rata with the assessment of Lever Brothers.

Mr. Pattullo (North Oxford) raised strong objection to the amendment. It would work great injury to the soap manufacturers in other parts of the Province, and would be a standing invitation to them to come and locate in Toronto. The measure should be labelled "a bill to concentrate the soap industry of the Province in the City of Toronto." He was given to understand that the existing soap manufacturers could make the entire output for the Dominion.

Mr. Kribs (South Waterloo) thought the opinion of the people of Toronto should be obtained upon these exemptions before the passage of the bill, which was really a bonus measure.

Mr. Crawford (West Toronto) admitted that the City of Toronto had not pronounced upon the exemption proposed by Mr. Barber, but when it was suggested in committee the city's representatives assented to it.

The Attorney-General admitted that the exemptions proposed were a bonus, but endless confusion would result if the bill were not allowed to pass. It would be unfair to grant exemption to Lever Brothers, and not to the other soap manufacturers. If all were put on the same footing it would be bonusing all the Toronto manufacturers. That was objectionable, but nevertheless it was the situation. The bill might pass with a further amendment that the exemption should only apply to soap manufacturers now established in the city.

Mr. Lucas (Centre Grey) said the bill, if passed, would exempt the soap manufacturers from all taxes. That was a startling thing to do, and he was decidedly against it.

Mr. Crawford said that since he had first spoken he had learned that no representative of the City Council had assented to the amendment proposed by Mr. Barber, and that the City Council had not asked for it.

Indecent, Says Mr. Pattullo.

Mr. Pattullo declared that it was indecent to railroad through a bill like this, at the influences of a lobby. He did not agree with the Attorney-General that they should allow the bill

to pass under any circumstances. There would be no complication, and no difficulty if the whole bill were thrown out.

Mr. Conmee moved that the bill be passed, subject to the approval of a majority of the ratepayers entitled to vote on money by-laws. Cries of "no" and "lost."

The amendment was then adopted by a standing vote. A provision was added, making it clear that the exemption should only apply to soap manufacturers already established in Toronto.

Mr. Marter moved to add a provision enabling the City Council of Toronto to grant aid to the sufferers from the Ottawa and Hull fire.

The amendment was agreed to, and Mr. Pattullo announced that in view of the provision enabling assistance to be given the sufferers from the Ottawa disaster he would withdraw further opposition to the bill. The measure was then reported with amendments and passed.

Toronto Railway Penalties.

On the motion for the third reading of the Toronto bill dealing with violations of agreement by the Street Railway Company, Mr. Barber moved to add a clause giving the courts power to compel the Street Railway Company to carry out its agreement with the city, notwithstanding any rule of law or practice to the contrary.

Mr. Conmee argued that the amendment would take away the rights of parties under contract.

Mr. Whitney asked would it not be easy to provide that the rights of any person should not be interfered with.

The Attorney-General—In other words that it shall not affect any existing contracts.

Mr. Conmee—That would do.

Mr. Whitney—No, not that, but provide that it shall not affect the rights of any party under the existing contract.

Calls it Flimflamming.

Mr. Foy (South Toronto) said the amendment of Mr. Barber would

carry out the real intent and purpose of the Railway Committee. Its object was that when the Railway Committee agreed to do certain things, and the corporation brought them into court, the court could compel the company to carry out their promise. At present, according to the company's contention, the courts could not compel them to run cars on streets which they declined to establish a service upon. Unless this amendment were adopted, the Legislature would be pretending to confirm a right which they were not compelling and it would be useless to pass the bill. The clause at present in the bill was a piece of jollying or flimflamming.

Attorney-General Protests.

The Attorney-General protested against the manner in which the last speaker had referred to the clause already in the bill. The amendment would apply the right of specific performance to every stipulation in the contract with the railway company, and how any person could argue that it did not change the contract, he could