

and that a new bill be introduced."

#### Anticipates Ruling.

But Mr. McCrae had even anticipated the ruling of the chair. He arose with a new bill in his hand, exactly the same as that which it was requested be withdrawn, and seconded by H. Hill, West Ottawa, moved for first reading.

Col. Price thereupon commenced all over again from a new angle. Admitting the correctness of the procedure of Mr. McCrae he begged to point out to the honorable Leader of the House the length of time required to thrash out anew on the floor of the Legislature principles already fought over in the first bill.

Premier Drury, with a suspicion of a smile, pointed out to the House that first, second and third readings could be given a measure in one day, providing the House was unanimous. "I would suggest," he said, "that if the honorable member would move for first, second and third readings he can possibly secure a sense of the feelings of the House."

The bill got first reading in a somewhat doubtful manner. J. W. Curry, K.C. (Southeast Toronto), urged that the House put its foot down and refuse leave for the introduction of the measure. He moved, and Hon. Thos. Crawford seconded, that the bill "be not now introduced." In the general manoeuvring, however, this motion was apparently lost sight of.

#### Aimed at Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Crawford also pointed out the consideration of the time involved in a discussion of the measure. "It is a bill strictly aimed at Toronto," he argued, "and there is no real reason for it. My honorable friend from Sudbury has no authority from Sudbury, nor no desire nor claim for any legislation in this line. There is no other city and no municipality, and no other railway, so far as we are able to understand it, than the city of Toronto and the Toronto Street Railway Company." Hon. Mr. Crawford declared his intention of putting the House on record on the first reading, and not wait until the second.

But the bill was declared to have received its first reading, and Hon. Mr. Crawford's intention was not carried out. Mr. McCrae then moved for second reading and proceeded to point out the dangerous situations existing in certain municipalities, where difficulties between employers and employees threatened to bring matters to an impasse. If there were trouble it would be at the door of the Legislature for refusing to carry his measure. His bill, he argued, was in the interests of the citizens, because it would enable them to get out of a difficult situation when that situation arose.

According to the ruling of the Speaker, unanimous consent of the House was necessary to give the bill second reading, and the measure dies its expected and unamerfed death when a chorus of "No's" declare their opposition.

#### Reverse Their Position.

Col. Price's bill to strengthen the Beck Act of 1909, providing that no changes can be made in a street railway franchise without a vote of the people, was the very next item of business. The principals in the fight on the McCrae Bill simply reversed their position and went at it again. Col. Price, at the morning session, explained that the measure was applicable particularly to London, Ont.

"This bill is intended to clear up a misapprehension," said the Colonel. "The intention of the bill in 1909 (the Beck Act) was to make it impossible for municipal corporations to give or change a franchise without submitting the matter to the ratepayers. Recently a decision was given in our courts in Ontario saying Municipal Councils could change a franchise without a vote of the electors, the reason being that they could modify the franchise."

#### Need Unanimous Consent.

Mr. Dewart's comments on the measure were not sympathetic. It was startling to say that the elected representatives of the people should not be allowed to pass on minor changes in franchise agreements. Premier Drury consented to first

reading in the morning, and, therefore, the bill came on in the afternoon for second reading, but, as with Mr. McCrae's bill, unanimous consent was necessary.

Charles McCrae was in favor. His remarks, laudatory of the measure, drew a reply from Dr. Stevenson, London, a hearty supporter of the bill. There was plenty of money in the railway affected, Dr. Stevenson said, to pay the wages asked for by the London Street Railwaymen and extra management if it were desired.

Mr. Dewart declared himself opposed to giving the bill second reading. It was just an effort, he said, to get away from and override a decision of the courts. He knew where the milk was in the cocoanut—the bill emanated from the head of the Hydro-electric Commission.

#### Hall For the Measure.

R. R. Hall, Liberal, Parry Sound, proceeded to argue in favor of the measure, when technical objection was made by opponents of the bill that, as unanimous consent was not forthcoming, second reading could not be given. Mr. Speaker sustained the point. Col. Price contested his ground by calling for a majority vote of the House on the suspension of the rules, and moved an appeal from Mr. Speaker's ruling.

Hon. George S. Henry wanted to talk on the measure at this juncture, and he, too, was halted by Mr. Dewart's technical objection that he was out of order. J. W. Curry suggested a way out of the dilemma by suggesting that the House should be polled whether or not the bill should be read a second time. Hon. Mr. Henry, however, was able to interject his regrets that, for the first time in his recollection he would have to vote against the ruling of the chair.

#### Opposes Chair's Ruling.

Hon. Thos. Crawford also said that for the first time he, too, would have to oppose the chair's ruling. He took the ground that Col. Price was justified in assuming from the reception accorded his bill in the morning that it would later on in the day be given second reading, or at least the dignity of discussion.

Premier Drury took occasion to point out the seriousness of the House voting to throw out a ruling of the Chair. While he himself had been prepared to vote for Col. Price's bill, he would hesitate against casting aside constitutional rules in order to have it put through.

T. Magladery, Timiskaming, suggested that if the second reading could not legally be given on the same day without a unanimous vote, there would be another day—one minute after midnight.

#### Rollo Upholds Speaker.

Before the vote on the motion to upset the Chair's ruling was taken, Hon. Walter Rollo pointed out that the ruling of Mr. Speaker was according to constitution. It was set by the statute and he had no alternative but to prohibit first reading, discussion and second reading all on the same day without a unanimous vote of the House.

The affirmatives and the negatives were called for, and of the comparative few who risked a verbal expression of either nature the "yes's" had it and the Chair was sustained. Thus Col. Price's bill was refused second reading, so far as yesterday was concerned.

Sir Adam Beck's comment on the Price bill last night was distinctly favorable to the measure. It closed up a loophole in the Beck Act of 1909, he said.