

Mr. Carscallen on resuming the debate on the Premier's bill to extend the life of Parliament, so that the next session may run its full term, said that measure had not in view any public convenience. It was rather an act to prolong the political existence of the Government. He thought it evident on the face of the bill that the Government intended to bring in next session a redistribution bill or other measures which they were afraid would be so bitterly opposed that the proper life of Parliament would expire before they were passed. He thought Parliament might meet earlier and Government measures be brought down sooner. In this connection he attacked the Keewatin Pulp Company agreement, arguing that this and like agreements gave the Government power to bleed the companies for election subscriptions. He moved that the bill be considered six months hence.

Object of the Extension.

The Premier said the object of the bill was not to prolong the life of the Government, but to prolong the life of Parliament till a convenient time to discharge the duties for which it was constituted. His plan was to have the House meet about the end of January, proceed leisurely, then the House would be dissolved and the election take place in June. They felt that it was in the interests of the candidates that a winter campaign should be avoided. (Hear, hear.) The Government were not afraid that their political life would be abbreviated by an appeal to the people. (Ministerial applause.) The census returns would be sufficiently complete for a redistribution, should that be necessary, without lengthening the term of Parliament. The Premier contended that Government business had been expedited during the present session, but said that matters were delayed by the length of the budget debate. This had been an onerous session, involving great application by the Government. In this connection the Premier deprecated the idea that every corporation's visit was accompanied by a slimy trail. It would be a sad commentary on Canadian politics if such were the case.

Mr. Whitney replied that this one little measure transcended in importance all the other bills of the session ten times over. They were there face to face with a deliberate attempt to change the constitution of the Province, and no hon. gentleman had been found ready to stand up and say it was a constitutional measure. It was a step towards absolute government. The reasons urged for the bill were puerile.

The motion for a six months' hoist was lost on a division by 27 to 38, Mr. Tucker voting with the Government and Mr. Farwell being absent without a pair.

The bill was read a third time and passed.

Succession Duties Act.

The Premier's bill to amend the succession duties act caused a long discussion. Col. Matheson said it was designed to raise more taxes, and criti-

cized several of the minor points of the measure. He moved that the net value of an estate be the basis on which it may be liable under the act, but the motion was declared lost on division.

The bill was reported, read a third time and passed.

Station Bill Withdrawn.

When the bill respecting the Union Station at Toronto was mentioned for third reading, Mr. McKee (North Essex), who introduced it, moved that it be withdrawn. This was done, and members on both sides of the House expressed their opinions by hearty and long-continued applause.

The Metropolitan.

It was half-past 11 when the Metropolitan Railway bill was reached on the order paper. There was an immediate assembling of members from the corridors. In the absence of Mr. Barber, Mr. Pattullo moved the second reading of the bill. He had authority, he said, to move to strike out the first twelve clauses of the bill, which were objected to by the city.

Mr. Foy rose to propose an amendment providing that the Metropolitan Railway should be deemed a street railway within the limits of the city. Tor-

onto, he said, was still interested in the bill, inasmuch as it gave the company authority to purchase the Scarborough' and Mimico lines, which extended within the city limits.

Mr. Conmee said he had understood the amendments were not to be pressed in view of the dropping of the twelve clauses.

Mr. Hill and Mr. Marter said they had understood it in the same way.

Mr. Pattullo (North Oxford) said he had understood that objection to other than the first twelve clauses would not be made if those clauses were dropped. This had been done, but if the hon. gentleman insisted on pressing his amendment he was instructed to withdraw the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis said that the objectionable clauses having been withdrawn, the amendment would have no effect, so far as the rest of the bill was concerned.

Mr. Graham (Brockville) said that if the bill had come up in its original form he would have voted against it. As the measure now stood he was in favor of it.

Mr. Conmee (West Algoma) held that the bill in its present form did not in any way affect Toronto. He wanted to say also that so far as he was concerned he had never taken the attitude that the city's rights should be overborne. The farthest that anyone had gone had been to suggest that in case of failure to arrive at an agreement the matter should be referred to an independent tribunal.

Hon. Mr. Stratton said he thought all present understood the measure and were able to decide it on its merits, without reference to the lobbying going on under the gallery, and which, he thought, was beneath the dignity of the House.

Mr. Foy said he had merely withdrawn to consult with Mr. Fullerton regarding the terms of the withdrawal of the clauses.