

the cost of such a commission should not deter them; if that method were thought to be the best it certainly should be given some consideration. At the present time the taxes were collected at practically no expense. In Michigan such a commission cost annually \$64,134, and in 1901 a special commission, which had prepared a report, which was the basis of taxing railways, had cost about \$200,000. In Wisconsin the railway commission cost \$23,000, and the tax commission \$32,000; in New York the commission cost \$66,782, and a railway grading commission cost about \$34,000. The bill proposed a commission of three persons. That would cost probably \$25,000 or \$30,000 per year. Yet, by continuing the present system, they would get practically the same results. It had been contended that the municipalities were not receiving enough from the railways, but they must not forget that whatever was collected by the Province was distributed among the municipalities in public institutions, etc.

The Premier suggested that the bill be referred to a select committee to see if some portions of the bill could not be adopted. The House would be endorsing the principle of increased taxation of railways, and the only difference that existed between the gentleman (Mr. Pettypiece) and himself was as to the mode of collecting these taxes. He himself was of opinion that they could get at these taxes just as well by the present system, although perhaps not on as broad a basis, but the result in the end would be the same. The bill could be considered even at this late stage of the session by the committee, and perhaps before the assessment bill was put through something might come from that committee which could be incorporated in it. "At present," concluded the Premier, "I think every public purpose is pretty well served by the system which is in force in the Province."

To What Committee?

Mr. Pettypiece insisted that only a Provincial board could levy the taxes equitably, and that the bulk of the taxation should go to the municipalities. The Premier had suggested a select committee to consider the bill. He wanted some committee to deal with the bill, and did not want the bill shuffled off as it was last year. If this Government did not deal with the question some other Government would when this one was out.

Mr. Whitney agreed with the Premier that the railways should not be treated harshly, but he said that the bill of Mr. Pettypiece had not received fair consideration. At the same time to ask for fair consideration was not to declare in favor of the bill.

The bill was then read a second time. The Premier then moved that it be referred to the following committee:—Messrs. Pettypiece, Dryden, Stock, Cameron (Huron), Davidson, Pense, Preston (Brant), Duff, Hoyle, Carscallen (Hamilton), Tucker, Smith (Sault Ste. Marie), and Clark, (Bruce).

Mr. Hanna protested against referring the bill to any committee, and moved in amendment that the matter be left to committee of the whole House.

The Speaker ruled that the amendment was out of order, as according to precedent a public bill introduced by a private member is referred, not to the committee of the whole House, but to a standing or select committee.

Mr. Pettypiece said that he had named the select committee, and was perfectly satisfied with it.

Mr. Downey refused to lend his assent to what was not a select committee, but "a set of pallbearers to carry out the bill."

The Speaker, after some discussion, said that he could not turn up the rule about the matter, but agreed with the leader of the Opposition that the House could control its own actions, and was inclined to submit the question to a decision of the House.

Hon. Mr. Gibson pointed out that the leader of the Opposition had not accepted a single provision of the

bill, but was anxious to get a vote which might embarrass the Government. Nothing could be more humiliating than the contrast between his attitude towards the bill on other occasions and on this.

The Speaker, after further discussion, said that though no doubt the House could control its own actions, the practice in all British Legislatures seemed to be to refer such bills to standing or select committees. In any event the bill could not be considered until after the recess, and he asked the House to adjourn the debate, so that in the interval he might have time to look up authorities. This was agreed to, Mr. Graham having the floor.

The House adjourned at 11.30 p. m. until Tuesday afternoon.

No Assignment.

An item in The Mail and Empire yesterday stated that Messrs. Conmee and Bowman had assigned their claims against the Algoma Central and the "Soo" companies to Mr. N. W. Rowell, K. C. Mr. Conmee states that there is no truth in the report; that no assignment was made to Mr. Rowell or to anyone else.

Deputation of School Principals.

A deputation, consisting of a committee of ten of the Principals of Toronto public schools, interviewed the Minister of Education yesterday afternoon and urged among other things that the model school term should be lengthened, that the number of model schools should be reduced, that graduates of the Normal College should not be permitted to teach in public schools without first taking a normal or a model school course, that Latin be not a compulsory subject for certificates, that the metric system should be taught, that less time should be devoted to arithmetic, and that a better text-book in history should be prepared.

OPPOSED TO LICENSE BILL.

TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION DISCUSSED.

Deputation of Prohibitionists Seeks Information From Mr. Whitney —Complaint Against the Brewers.

Temperance legislation was the chief topic under discussion at a caucus of the Liberal members of the Legislature yesterday afternoon. A number of the representatives advised strongly against the introduction at this session of a license bill, but the meeting adjourned without coming to a decision.

A deputation of temperance men waited upon the Opposition leader yesterday morning. Mr. Whitney afterwards stated that it was a purely informal chat, the deputation being desirous of getting his opinion on the probabilities of a temperance bill being introduced by the Government. On this deputation were James Hales, J. A. Austin, A. J. Keefer, Rev. Mr. Walsh of Brampton, Rev. Mr. Dunlop and several others.

A deputation representing the liquor interests waited upon the Provincial Secretary yesterday to protest against the alleged practice of one or two of the leading brewers obtaining leases of properties over the heads of the present occupants of the premises and forcing them to purchase their manufacture.

GUARDING OF CROSSINGS.

MAY BE IMPOSED ON ALL RAILROAD COMPANIES.

Government Will Consider an Amendment to the General Railway Bill —Toronto Suburban and Hamilton.

An interesting feature of the discussion on the Toronto suburban bill before the Railway Committee of the Legislature yesterday arose over a proposal of the City of Toronto to insert a clause that the company must protect its crossings at its own expense. Mr. A. H. Royce entered a strong protest against an obligation which was imposed on no other company.

Hon. Mr. Dryden favored the principle of the city's proposal, but thought they were going the wrong way about it. He said that he would call the attention of his colleagues to the matter, with a view to getting an amendment to the general railway act. On this understanding the amendment was dropped.

Mr. MacKelcan, K.C., for Hamilton, strongly objected to allowing the railway to cross Burlington Beach, which has already two railways, and is a suburban residential quarter. An amendment was added that the permission of the Township of Saltfleet, in which the Beach is located, must first be obtained.

A clause similar to that put in the Mimico Railway bill last year was added, requiring the company to get the consent of the municipality to leave a public highway and enter on a private right of way, and the bill as so amended went through.

The opposition to the Thunder Bay, Nipigon & St. Joe Railway's bill was withdrawn, and it went through with a reduction of time to five years instead of seven years for completion.

The City of London opposed the bill to authorize extensions of the lines of the Strathroy & Western Railway Company between Port Stanley and St. Thomas, and that particular section was laid over. The time for commencing the railway was reduced from three to two years.