

SPEED LIMIT IS INCREASED

But Motorists Must Slow
Down at Inter-
sections

Motorists won their fight on the floor of the Legislature yesterday to be allowed to drive their cars at a higher rate of speed than under the existing law. There was an acrimonious fight, which lasted for an hour, before the battle was finally decided. Then it was only after a vote had been taken in committee. The fight will be renewed on the third reading of the bill, when Allan Studholme of East Hamilton was told it would then be proper to demand the yeas and nays.

The clause permitting the higher rate of speed has been changed slightly from what it was when it left the Municipal Committee a few days ago. When the committee got through threshing it out, the decision was that motorists could drive their cars at 20 miles an hour in urban centres, and at 25 miles an hour in the country. The present speed limit was thus raised five miles in each case. The change effected in the committee of the whole House was that the 25 miles an hour in the country and 20 miles an hour in urban centres remains, but there is an additional clause that in urban centres, where the driver has not a clear view at intersections, he must not drive faster than 10 miles an hour; in the country he must not exceed 12 1-2 miles an hour.

Heated Discussion.

But before this decision was arrived at there was a lengthy, and at times, heated discussion. The House swayed back and forth, first favoring one argument and then another. Fully two score of the members participated in the debate.

Mr. J. C. Elliott of West Middlesex introduced an amendment after the discussion had been in progress for a few minutes. It provided for the amending of the bill to allow the existing law to remain in force—15 miles an hour in cities, towns and villages, and 20 miles an hour in the country.

An amendment to the amendment was brought in by Mr. Mark Irish of Northeast Toronto, which was to the effect that the rate of speed should remain at 15 miles an hour in the cities, towns and villages, and be increased to 25 miles an hour in the country. While the discussion was going on on these questions, the Opposition Leader, Mr. Proudfoot, wanted to know why Mr. George H. Gooderham of Southwest Toronto did not introduce an amendment incorporating the views he expressed about slowing down at intersections. If the Southwest Toronto member did not do so, the Opposition Leader said he would.

A vote was taken on Mr. Irish's amendment, which was defeated. Mr. Gooderham thereupon introduced the amendment, which was carried, providing for slowing down at intersections. This was carried, although there were quite a number shouted "no" when the vote was taken. Mr. Studholme rose to protest, and demanded the "yeas" and "nays." Sir William replied that that request could be made at third reading.

GOVT. KILLS THE MET. BILL

Comes Too Late and Council
Not Committing Itself,
Says Premier

MAKES A STATEMENT

No legislation is to be passed at this session of the Legislature enabling the city of Toronto to solve the Metropolitan Railway problem. Although the City Council wrestled with the matter all day yesterday, the city's draft bill to enable it to take over the road received its death-blow at midnight, when the Prime Minister, Sir William Hearst, made a statement in the Legislature explaining the Government's position. It was another case in which the Government plainly told the city of Toronto that its legislation must come in early in the session, and not in the last hours. It was the second time in two days that Toronto bills were disallowed because of the lateness of time in which they were received.

Sir William explained that the city had handed to the Government at a late hour in the afternoon a draft bill which would have necessitated a special meeting of the Private Bills Committee to-morrow. The House had arranged to sit in the morning, and it would have been difficult to have the meeting of the committee. However, the Government would be prepared to call the committee and submit the bill for its consideration were it not for the fact that the Council, while asking that the bill be passed, had definitely declined to commit itself in any way to the policy involved, so that, even if the committee were called and the bill reported, it might remain a dead letter. In view of the fact that the city knew the House would soon adjourn, the Government did not feel justified in suspending all the rules of the House to put a bill through which probably would not be acted upon.