

not understand. The language of the clause in the bill was distinct and free from doubt. Even that clause was to some extent an interference with the contract.

Mr. Whitney argued that the clause in the bill was just as objectionable as the amendment. The effect of the judgment of the courts was that they would like to make an order compelling the street railway to live up to its agreement, but they lacked the legislative power. The clause now in the bill would not improve the matter at all.

The Power Already Exists.

Hon. Mr. Harcourt argued that the section in the bill was as clearly written, as free from ambiguity, and as definite in its aim as the English language could make it, and the court could give such remedy as the facts of the case would warrant. The contract certainly would be varied by the introduction of the words proposed, "notwithstanding any rule of law or practice to the contrary."

Mr. Crawford spoke in favor of the amendment. Those opposed to the use of the words evidently did not wish to make the operation of the law as simple as was intended.

The Attorney-General remarked that the clause in the bill would compel the extension of the company's line of railway. The amendment proposed would apply to all the details of the agreement with the city.

Mr. Whitney.—Yes, why not?

Mr. Gibson.—It takes out of the hands of the court the power to give any form of relief.

The Speaker put the amendment and Mr. Conmee called for the yeas and nays, and was supported in this by Mr. Whitney.

The House divided on Mr. Barber's amendment, which was carried by a vote of 52 to 14.

The bill was then amended, and read a third time. Mr. Conmee regretted the action of the Legislature, because, he said, it would enable a new contract to be made by a city to replace a bad or improvident one, which might be made by neglectful Aldermen.

Grant to the Sufferers.

A resolution granting \$25,000 was then introduced and passed.

Mr. Berkeley Powell thanked the House for its generosity. He said blankets and food were needed badly at once. He read messages from Ottawa giving further details as to the sufferers and the arrangements for their relief. It was stated that 3,000 houses had been burned, and 15,000 people, half of whom were absolutely destitute, had been rendered homeless.

Mr. Whitney said that in view of the appalling circumstances of this fire there ought to be no cavilling over the amount to be granted. The Government's resolution was eminently proper.

The Algoma Land Grant.

Mr. Lucas (Centre Grey) continued the debate on the bill granting 1,500,000 acres of land to the Algoma Central Railway. He complained of the attempt to rush this bill through the House without discussion.

The Attorney-General—You had the opportunity in committee. Why did

you not avail yourself of it?

Mr. Lucas condemned the whole agreement, and said this road was simply a tramway to bring products to the Clergue works at the Soo.

Concessions Are Necessary.

Mr. Russell (East Hastings) supported the Government's policy in opening up New Ontario, and said it would be warmly endorsed by the people. The granting of concessions was no new thing. All Governments had made concessions, even on a much more colossal scale than this. He instanced the action of the French Government with respect to Canada in its early history, and the large grants made by the British Government in South Africa for the purpose of developing the country. In the past it had been quite common to make land grants in Canada, one of the most notable being that to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The railway would go through a country which had been comparatively well lumbered over and explored by prospectors. The Ottawa disaster had thrown a thousand laborers out of employment, and hence they should welcome the enterprises of Mr. Clergue, which would employ so many artisans and operatives. Toronto stood to gain largely by the development of the northern regions, and so did the towns along the Georgian Bay.

Col. Matheson's Criticisms.

Mr. Matheson (South Lanark) condemned the Government for bringing down a bill granting 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 acres of land in the last 48 hours of the session. Now the Government had renewed the debate deliberately at a time when members were absent from the House. He did not blame Mr. Clergue for getting all he could, but the Ministry should be censured for giving so much of the country away when the railway could have been secured on terms more advantageous to the Province. What must they think of the Government's action in making this grant, when a year ago Mr. Clergue assured the Railway Committee that he would not ask for a land grant or cash subsidy? The industrial conditions in regard to pulp had greatly changed. Pulpwood, which formerly was worth only 25 cents a cord, now cost from \$5 to \$7 per cord. The Government were making a present of 30,000,000 cords of pulpwood to Mr. Clergue. Estimating the quantity of pulpwood at five cords to the acre, the Government would lose \$3,000,000 in dues, or \$15,000 per mile. It must be remembered, too, that the swamp lands were not included in the grant, so that Mr. Clergue would have the pick of the pulpwood lands. Valuing the lands at \$5 per acre, that would mean \$7,500,000, which would leave a surplus of nearly \$3,000,000 after building the railway. There was no condition whatever as to the price at which the settlers could get the land. The Government had not made any provision for the building of stations at a certain distance apart; they might be placed twenty miles apart. He thought the bill should be laid over for a year, to give the people a chance to consider its provisions.