

than that bill; also adding a clause that bridges belonging to or connecting two municipalities should be assessed as a whole or an integral part of the whole.

The Bill Debated.

Mr. Marter (North Toronto) contended that the measure advised by the commission should be carried. He did

not think that the bill now before the House went far enough.

Mr. Pardee (West Lambton) thought that the House would do well to await the complete report of the Assessment Commission before taking so radical a step as that proposed by the Opposition.

Mr. Pattullo (North Oxford) held that the Government bill corrected the scrap-iron assessment, and it was difficult to understand why Mr. Foy insisted on bringing in a measure for the same purpose. For his own part, he preferred the measure introduced by the Government to that of the hon. member for South Toronto. He concluded by expressing the opinion that the charges regarding the influence of corporations would not, after the remarks of the Premier on the subject, be heard again.

Mr. Foy said that the speeches made had generally wandered far from the real subject, but had only tended to strengthen his contentions.

Mr. Graham (Brockville) believed that the act now brought in by the Premier was the most direct, the shortest and the best way to overcome the difficulties of the scrap-iron assessment. Before any other part of the question was touched an opportunity should be given to allow the whole people to become thoroughly acquainted with the changes proposed.

On a party division the amendment to the amendment was carried by 40 to 30. The bill was reported by committee, read a third time and passed.

Veterans' Land Grant.

When the motion was made for the third reading of the bill granting land to veterans, Hon. Mr. Davis quoted from a similar bill in British Columbia, where the beneficiaries were confined to South African veterans, and on far narrower conditions than in Ontario.

The Speaker decided that the amendments were in order. On a party division the amendments were lost by 30 to 40, and the bill passed.

New Year's Day Voting.

On the motion for the third reading of the municipal amendment act, Mr. Marter moved an amendment providing for the holding of municipal elections on New Year's Day in cities of over 100,000. Toronto, he said, had declared in favor of this by a majority of 10,000.

Col. Matheson (South Lanark) objected to giving Toronto such a special privilege, which would soon be wanted by every other town in the country.

Hon. Mr. Latchford said there was a considerable minority in the City of Toronto who would strongly object to being called out to vote on New Year's Day.

Mr. Crawford (West Toronto) said he did not know that any religious body in

the city objected to vote on New Year's Day. He knew that many people belonging to the denomination of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Latchford) was an honored member voted in large numbers when the election fell on New Year's Day.

Mr. Wardell (North Wentworth) said that Catholics and many Presbyterians had strong objections to the proposal.

Mr. Marter replied that on making inquiries he had not found any Catholics who were adverse to voting on New Year's Day.

Religious Objections.

Hon. Mr. Stratton said that on previous occasions largely signed petitions had been received from various denominational bodies protesting against the proposal. The granting of the privilege to Toronto would be the insertion of the thin end of the wedge, and it would have to be extended to the whole Province. He did not think a majority of the citizens of Toronto were in favor of the measure.

Mr. Foy (South Toronto) was not aware that there was any demand now for such an act from the City of Toronto. It was true that ten years ago the citizens by vote expressed a desire for New Year's Day voting. That was ten years ago, and before the hours of polling were lengthened. Since then there had been no agitation.

The Premier, on the request of Mr. Whitney, expressed his opinion. He said that he had intended to vote for the amendment, but on the representation of Hon. Mr. Latchford, Mr. Wardell and others as to the views taken by a religious denomination he had decided that such legislation would be invidious.

Mr. Whitney was directly opposed to playing fast and loose with the municipal act. New Year's Day was an old and long established holiday, and he saw no reason why they should break in upon it. For this and other reasons he opposed the motion.

Mr. Marter said he had introduced the amendment at the request of the City of Toronto, but after the expression of opinion in the House desired to withdraw it, and accordingly did so.

Conmee Act and Toronto.

Mr. Marter then moved the amendment of the bill by providing that the Conmee act shall not apply to Toronto. He referred to the incorporation of the Consumers' Gas Company and the result of the suit by Mr. Johnston a few years ago, when it was decided the company could refuse to sell gas to any person. The city could not buy out the company, which enjoyed a monopoly, unless it was freed from the Conmee act.

Mr. Conmee (West Algoma), the author of the act referred to, said there was not a line in the act to prevent the city buying out the company. What harm could come to the city from making a proposal as to price, as provided in the act? The city was, he declared, in a better position than it could have been under the old law. He agreed with Mr. Whitney that the municipal law should be consistent and not be a rope of sand. If the provisions of the bill were struck out as regards Toronto there was no justifi-