introduced, Mr. Halcrow last nignt in the Legislature asked permission to withdraw it. Members of the sub-committee objected, and, after some discussion, the bill stood over for consideration at a later date, and also to ascertain if, in case member in whose name the bill stands does not move second reading, any other member can.

Contentious Subject.

Several members spoke on subject and reviewed the controversy that has been raging in Hamilton concerning the clubhouse. The contention of the opponents of the original bill was that the money, provided in the first place by the City Council, the Rotary Club and by means of a tag day, was for the benefit of all veterans.

Mr. Halcrow maintained that the Great War Veterans' Association was the only association of the kind in existence at the time, and that the redrafted bill took away from the G.W.V.A. the clubhouse and vested it in other organizations which had not contributed anything in the way of money. Some of those who asked him to introduce the bill now asked him to withdraw it, Mr. Halcrow explained.

Whip and Leader Disagree.

The House saw the spectacle of the Conservative Leader and the Whip of the Conservative party, Joseph Thompson, Northeast Toronto, take opposite views on the bill. Hon. G. H. Ferguson thought by withdrawing the bill, waiting for the amalgamation of various veteran bodies to take place, which, he was assured, was possible probably this fall, the problem would be simplified. Mr. Thompson, on the other hand, thought that amalgamation would be helped along, in Hamilton, at any rate, by putting through the redrafted bill.

Finally Hon. W. E. Raney suggested that Mr. Halcrow might see the trustees and try to arrive at some understanding. Mr. Halcrow then consented to the bill standing over, though, he said, the Attorney-General did not realize the hot water he was getting into by such

action.

LABOR SPLITS ON LONDON BILL

Strong Protests Made at Legislature Jeopardizing City's Contract

PROVE FUTILE PLEAS

The pleas of Dr. H. A. Stevenson, Labor member for London, and of Hon. Walter Rollo, Minister of Labor, fell on deaf ears yesterday in the Legislature when they argued for the observance of the sanctity of contracts between municipalities and private corporations. Despite their objections, supported by the arguments of J. C. Tolmie, Liberal member for Windsor, the act respecting the London Street Railway, which gives the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board the power to increase or decrease fares on that railway, regardless of any agreement existing between the city and the company, passed second reading.

Splits Labor Vote.

The bill came up for consideration a few minutes before 6 o'clock, and the standing vote was taken just at The two front - bench Cabinet Ministers present, Messrs. Raney and Doherty, voted for the bill, as did Messrs. Tooms and Homuth, Labor members for Peterboro' East and South Waterloo, respectively. The other Labor members, led by Hon. Walter Rollo, opposed the bill, but beyond three or four Farmer members and a handful from Opposition parties, including Mr. Tolmie, the bill drew support from every part of the House.

The bill passed the Private Bills Committee some weeks ago, and R. L. Brackin, Liberal member for West Kent, in whose name it stands, in moving for second reading yesterday, said the change made by this committee was to the effect that the power of increasing or decreasing the fare was placel in the hands of the Railway Board.

London Strongly Objects.

Dr. H. A. Stevenson, member for London, was on his feet in a mo-Objections, he said, had ment. come to this bill from the city of London. The city was opposed to it in every form. The House, he proceeded, should consider seriously before passing the bill, as it affected the agreement between the city and the Railway Company. The charter of the company would run out shortly and already an Alderman had given notice in Council that the railway should vacate the city streets.

"If this bill passes in the House, this House invades the rights of every municipality in the Province," said Dr. Stevenson. There would be no use in municipalities making agreements with private corporations, because they would know the House could override them. He cited the instances of the agreement entered into between municipalities and the Hydro-electric Power Commission. The House could also override those agreements. The thing to do in this case was to let London take over the railway and run it. That was the only solution.

Should Keep Contracts.

"I am opposed to the principle of the bill," said Mr. Tolmie. tracts, he said, ought to be lived up to. A similar bill had been turned down last year, "and we ought to be very slow in doing what we refused to do a year ago."

J. W. Curry, Southeast Toronto, said in committee it had been brought out that the agreement was one-sided. The city did not have to take over the railway, but the railway had to continue operating even

at a loss.

Leslie Oke, U.F.O. member for East Lambton, said he did not think it was good practice for the House to reverse the decision of the committee.

Hon. Walter Rollo said the contract was made in good faith, a contract that London was not prepared to break, but that the company wanted broken. The parties could not get together, so application was made to the Legislature. Answering Mr. Curry, he said that no assurance would be given now, as was asked before the Private Bills Committee, that would be binding when the contract expired, that the road would be taken over by the city. The action to be taken then would depend on the circumstances prevailing at the time.

His opposition to these kind of bills had always been on principle. he said, but he had found that just as soon as Toronto had taken over the street railway system the fare had been raised to seven cents. If the fares in London were to be increased to give the men decent wages, then there ought to be obtained some kind of undertaking from the company what it was going

to do with the increased fares.