

COMMITTEE APPROVES MR. HANNA'S SCHEME

Disregards Ellis Bill on Ottawa Water Question

UTMOST LICENSE URGED

Vote Arrays Ottawa Members Against Each Other—Final Solution Depends Upon Recommendation of the Provincial Board of Health.

The Ottawa water question was again thrashed out in lively fashion before the Private Bills Committee yesterday when the bills of Mr. Ellis and Hon. Mr. Hanna were up. In view of the recent vote of the electors of Ottawa against the 31-Mile Lake scheme, Mr. Hanna's bill commanded almost the entire attention of the committee, and although there was some opposition to it, it was decided to adopt the principle, leaving alterations in some details to a sub-committee of Messrs. Dunlop (North Renfrew), McCrea (Sudbury), Lennox (North York), Atkinson (North Norfolk), and Ross (Kingston), with the assistance of the attorneys on either side. The bill comes up again this morning before being reported.

Hon. Mr. Hanna stated that for three years Ottawa had been agitating about the water question. The time had come when the matter had to be settled. The people of Ottawa were not, and never would be, agreed with regard to any scheme that was put forward. The Currie-McVeity scheme was voted on and carried by a majority of the people. The Provincial Board of Health had already reported favorably on an Ottawa River scheme, known as the Hazen scheme, but he was told by the board that it did not necessarily follow that the Currie-McVeity scheme would be in the same class. Mr. Hanna stated that his bill was prepared by the man who was deputed by the City Council of Ottawa to represent them. It was more of a suggestion than a bill. The Currie-McVeity scheme was subject to the approval of the Provincial Board of Health, to be given, or not, at the season when proper examination can be made. If the Currie-McVeity scheme did qualify, the City Council of Ottawa should have the widest license to have a scheme that would be satisfactory, and prevent them coming for legislation to avoid typhoid in the city of Ottawa.

Asks for Final Decision.

Mr. G. F. Henderson, Ottawa City Council adviser, said it was desirable that there should be finality with regard to this water question.

Mr. Hanna said that if the Ottawa River scheme qualified that would end it, but if it did not, then it was for the city of Ottawa to adopt the 31 Mile Lake or any other scheme which had already been approved. Replying to an objection by Mr. McGarry, he pointed out that it was made clear this was subject to the approval of the Board of Health.

Mr. McGarry said they might as well do away with municipalities if the board were to have such favors, an utterance which drew loud dissent and drove Mr. McGarry to exclaim: "I am not a bit dismayed by the number of interruptors." He submitted that as the people had expressed themselves in favor of the Ottawa River scheme, it should be the only one dealt with at present.

Mr. T. H. Lennox thought, in view of the result of the plebiscite in favor of the Ottawa River scheme, it was unfair, if that was not approved by the Board of Health, to obliterate the Hazen scheme. It was apparent the people did not want to go the length of \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000. Mr. Champagne persisted that a vote should be taken on Mr. Hanna's bill,

and the principle was adopted by 13 to 8, Mr. Ellis (West Ottawa) voting for the bill, and Mr. Champagne (East Ottawa) against.

Admitted as Law Student.

The committee agreed that James George Guys-Bagley be regarded as a fourth year law student, and would now be subject to the rules and regulations applying in the case of final examination. Hon. Mr. Hanna said he thought a strong case had been made out to let this go through, for in the circumstances they should make an exception. He thought it was the right of every citizen to be a lawyer, practise law, and give advice.

PROVINCE CANNOT CANCEL LAND GRANTS

Opinion of Armstrong of Central Railway of Canada

SUBSIDIES ARE EXPECTED

Vice-President of the Road Replies to Hon. W. H. Hearst and Says His Company is Entitled to Land Grants Provided for Years Ago.

(Canadian Associated Cable.)

London, April 16.—Vice-President Armstrong of the Central Railway of Canada to-day replies to the statements made by Hon. W. H. Hearst, Ontario Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines. Mr. Armstrong says that his company, as holder of the entire share capital of the Carrillon & Grenville Railway Company, is entitled to build a line between Montreal and Ottawa, either partly in the Province of Quebec and partly in the Province of Ontario, or wholly in Quebec, under an act of the old Province of Canada, passed before the creation of the Province of Ontario, and that the company is entitled to land grants in whichever Province the line is constructed. Control of the public lands was obtained by the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec under the act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom known as the British North America act, which expressly preserves the rights of third parties. Notwithstanding this provision, the Legislature of Ontario in 1912 passed an act purporting to cancel the land grants, "but this company," says Mr. Armstrong, "is advised by eminent Canadian and English counsel that it is not competent for the Provincial Legislature to thus override the provisions of a statute of the United Kingdom, and that this company's title to the land grants is unimpeachable.

"The Legislature of Ontario, on a previous occasion," he said, "endeavored to avoid its obligations under the acts referred to, and refused to deliver the lands earned by the Canada Central Railway, but the courts of Ontario held that the Government was liable, and by arrangement with the company the Government paid them the value of the lands in cash."

Dominion Subsidies.

In consequence of disclaimers and the comments issued on behalf of Premier Borden and Hon. Mr. Hearst the company has circularized the subscribers to the recent issue giving an option to withdraw. Speaking of the Dominion subsidies, the circular says: "The Dominion subsidy was received as late as September, and, under a contract with the Government, the company will be entitled to further payments as the necessary works are completed. While the Premier has announced that the Government does not expect to introduce a subsidy bill this session, this expectation may or may not be realized. If it is, the result will be that a consideration of the company's application for the usual subsidies on its main line will be delayed. The company, however, has no reason for supposing that any such delay would affect the question of its receiving the usual subsidies.