

Electric Light Company stock.

Mr. Curry—You may have paid dividends on money never invested. If you hadn't done that you might now have a fund to carry on. You have been taking it out of the inhabitants for a long time. Can't you make the rich years balance the lean ones?

Civic Cars Worse Crowded.

Mr. Fleming was sure that the civic cars were the real loaded cars. "They make me look like a novice in loading cars," he said.

"This bill (the original)," said G. R. Geary, representing the city, "is in effect really a combination of a number of private bills." He complained that the city had received no notice of it and it was too drastic a measure to be introduced in the dying days of a long session. It struck at the very root of contract and agreement.

The board's interest, he said, was that the public should be served. "If the company cannot carry on a railway, neither can this board, unless there are quick assets on which we could realize. If the men don't accept the Board of Conciliation award we can't carry on. It does shock the conscience to think of increasing fares in the face of a contract. Fares are the only revenue we know." He thought, regarding Toronto, that it was rather a matter for the city than for the board. If the board went into the matter of other subsidiary companies it would mean litigation.

No, Says R. J.

Mr. Curry wanted to know, if the company did not pay over its percentage to the city, if it could meet expenses.

Mr. Fleming said, "No."

"If there isn't money for us from the fare boxes to run the road we will withdraw," said Mr. McIntyre. "If the city had the power to increase rates and chose to do so to give us the money to run the road, then we could proceed. That is being done to-night in London."

Members of the committee thought this could not apply to Toronto under the present contract and without legislation in the Legislature.

Mayor Church said the city did not want such power.

"You don't know that," replied Mr. Curry, who further protested that there was no statement from the company as to the earnings and where they had gone. They should have provided a reserve fund.

Voting on Motion.

Mr. Brackin then moved that the clause of the act proposed by the Railway Board should be substituted for the first clause in the original bill. This carried, the committee voting as follows: For the amendment—Hon. F. C. Biggs, Hon. H. C. Nixon, H. H. Dewart, W. E. N. Sinclair, R. L. Brackin, Charles McCrea and Allen; against, Hon. D. Carmichael, J. W. Curry, Col. Price, Hon. Walter Rollo, Hon. Peter Smith. On the substitution of the next clause only Carmichael, Curry and Price were opposed.

As Charles McCrea was sponsor for the bill, the chair in the committee was taken by Hon. W. E. Raney, who did not vote on any of the questions. The original bill would have been defeated easily.

PREMIER MAY ALTER SINGLE TAX MEASURE

States That Order in Council May be Made Necessary

GROUPS ARE DIVIDED

None of Them Unanimous As Regards Legislation in Question

Heeding the criticism from various members, Premier Drury seems inclined to add a cautionary clause to his act, which would allow municipalities to wipe out gradually the tax on improvements. When the bill was being debated in Committee of the Whole yesterday he announced that he might add a clause that the by-laws could not be submitted except through order in Council by the Government, and that in the order the place or places would be named.

Hon. Geo. S. Henry suggested an alternative course that the privilege of vote on such by-laws be left with the Municipal Council, and that the clause giving the right of a vote on a petition signed by ten per cent. of the electors be thrown out. One of these suggestions will probably be adopted by the House when the bill is further discussed in Committee of the Whole.

The various groups in the House were by no means unanimous in their opinions of the bill. Premier Drury spoke in favor of it. One of the U.F.O. members, H. K. Denyes (East Hastings), was opposed, H. H. Dewart was also opposed, while Z. Mageau (Sturgeon Falls), was in favor of it, "particularly as far as Northern Ontario is concerned."

Result of Agitation.

Mr. Dewart declared that the demand had not come from a sufficiently-large part of the community to justify the measure. "It is," he said, "I think the result of agitation rather than common-sense. Are there petitions from strong municipalities urging it? I think not." He pointed out that Ottawa had voted the measure down.

Premier Drury said that neither Ottawa nor Toronto constituted the whole Province. He was not a theoretical single-taxer, but he wanted this bill passed to meet a case existent in the townships, and particularly in Northern Ontario. Half the townships were contravening the law now, and this act simply made legal what was being done illegally at the present time. The act did not compel the measure in any municipality. Why, he asked, could it not be left to the intelligent voters of Toronto to say if they wanted it?

Gives North a Chance.

Z. Mageau said that it gave the Northern townships a chance, and that he would support it. He also pointed out that a few years ago he had moved a resolution in the House asking for the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Henry, speaking of townships immediately adjacent to a city which had been subdivided into lots, thought that many of these would be thrown back on the municipality because the owners would not pay the taxes. He contended, also, that it would create a bad condition in housing, in that builders would build on the narrowest lots possible in order to save taxes.

"Would it not put idle land back on the market?" asked the Premier.

"I do not think so," replied Mr.