

would not put it in the hands of two or three men to go behind the backs of the society and raise their rates. (Applause.) The people of this country are so wedded to self-government, even self-misgovernment, if I may say so— (laughter)— that they won't stand for this sort of thing. They want to work out their own salvation. (Applause.)

#### Hurled Out of Office.

Mr. Steve Burns of the Sons of England Benefit Society strongly opposed the measure, and declared that if Messrs. Lee and Paterson advocated the thing before any society they would be "hurled out of office."

The committee then considered the bill respecting the Order of Canadian Home Circles, which was supported by Mr. Norman Sommerville and opposed by Mr. Agnew. This bill relates to the distribution of a reserve fund of \$200,000. There was considerable wrangling while the measure was being dealt with, but it was evident a majority of the committee were in favor of the bill.

## COL. LENNOX "JOKER" CENSURED BY LUCAS

Move Was to Make "City Get  
Cars for Toronto Ry. Co.

### CITY MEMBERS FOR IT

Gooderham and Hook Come Under the  
Ban of the Attorney-General, Who  
Refuses to Report "Such a Foolish  
Clause."

Hon. I. B. Lucas, Chairman of the Private Bills Committee of the Legislature, refused to be fooled by the "joker" which Colonel T. Herbert Lennox, M.P.P., yesterday put through, that the city itself must get the additional street cars for Toronto. The Attorney-General made it abundantly plain that he would not report such a clause, and he would deal with the matter in the House if necessary. "I won't report such a foolish clause as responsible Chairman of this committee," he said. The Lennox motion was that the city get 100 cars in 1917 and 100 cars in 1918 and sell them to the company at a reasonable price. This was carried by 22 votes to 8. The committee also, by 19 votes to 9, decided to validate the Railway Board's order, which calls upon the Toronto Railway Company to furnish 200 more cars, the board having the right to modify its order in future if it is found that the cars cannot be secured.

As there was no sign of agreement as to the two motions, the committee adjourned, on the understanding that the Law Clerk, with Mr. Lucas and Colonel Lennox, will endeavor to draft a clause which will prove satisfactory. Of the Toronto members, Messrs. Gooderham and Hook voted for Col. Lennox's motion, and Mr. Crawford against. Messrs. Gooderham and Hook also supported the motion validating the Railway Board's order. Mr. Crawford, of course, supported the Railway Board's order.

The city had agreed to waive its right to have the cars built in Toronto, as set forth in the company's franchise agreement. It also agreed to have any nominee of the Railway Board inspect the company's factory and books, and report progress in the manufacture of cars, instead of Works Commissioner Harris, as the Railway Board order provides.

J. W. Bain, K.C., contested the city's attempt to embody in their bill a clause ratifying and validating the Railway Board's order of February 27th, compelling the Toronto Railway Company to build 200 new street cars. Works Commissioner Harris declared that it was patent from the Toronto Railway Company's attitude that they wanted to appeal against the order, and the consequence would

be that the matter would be held up and perhaps ultimately would go before the Privy Council. "Meanwhile the public will have to suffer from overcrowding," said Mr. Harris.

Mr. Sinclair (South Oxford)—If we passed such a clause validating this order would it cut off the right of appeal?

City Solicitor Johnston said that was the intention.

The vote on the Colonel Lennox motion was:

For—Bowman, Brower, Calder, Dargavel, Ducharme, Gooderham, Hall (Waterloo), Hay, Hook, Hurdman, Jaques, Jessop, Johnson, Lennox, Marshall, Martyn, Mills, Nixon, Pinard, Preston (Durham), Preston (Lanark), Sinclair. Against—Cameron, Crawford, Elliott, Henry, Hilliard, Musgrove (Huron), McDonald, Rankin.

The vote on the motion to validate the Ontario Railway Board's order was:

For—Cameron, Crawford, Dargavel, Elliott, Gooderham, Henry, Hilliard, Hook, Hurdman, Jaques, Jessop, Johnson, Marshall, Martyn, Musgrove (Huron), McDonald, Preston (Durham), Rankin, Sinclair. Against—Brower, Calder, Hall, Hay, Lennox, Mills, Nixon, Pinard, Preston (Lanark).

## WHAT NICKEL QUEST HAS COST ONTARIO

Mr. Dewart Asks Government  
as to Expense Bills and  
Practical Results

Mr. H. Hartley Dewart (Southwest Toronto) has given notice that he will put the following questions in the Legislature regarding the Nickel Commission:

(1) What has been the cost of the Ontario Nickel Commission since the first day of February, 1917?

(a) For salaries or payments by way of remuneration or honorarium to each member of the Commission respectively?

(b) For travelling expenses of each member of the Commission respectively?

(c) For allowance in lieu of travelling expenses to each member of the Commission respectively?

(d) For other purposes, specifying such purposes and amounts?

(2) What honorarium, remuneration or salary is payable or to be paid to the members of the Commission other than G. T. Holloway?

#### An Expensive Asset.

(3) Is the Chairman, G. T. Holloway, still in the Government employ at the salary of \$20,000 per year and \$10 per day in lieu of travelling expenses, and, if so, when will the obligation of the Government cease?

(4) Are the travelling expenses of the said G. T. Holloway from Toronto to Great Britain to be paid by the Government in addition to the allowance made to him?

(5) What were the services rendered by each of the following parties in respect of which payments were made to them for salary, as shown in the return of the 16th of February, 1916, respectively: Professor George A. Guess, salary, \$1,250; F. Clithero, salary, \$388.54; G. W. Dixon, salary, \$359.03; A. L. Clark, salary, \$600; R. N. Dickson, salary, \$485; A. Stanfield, salary, \$200; E. M. Tozer, salary, \$306.60; E. A. Wilson, salary, \$210.73.

#### Nickel Refining in Ontario.

Mr. Dewart also has the following additional questions: What is the process of refining that it is proposed to adopt in the suggested nickel refinery at Port Colborne?

Has the new "process" been commercially proved; and, if so, where, or is it merely a laboratory process?

Have patents been granted for the new "process"; and, if so, whom, when, under what names and under what numbers are they recorded?