London's Safety!

Why the London Bill Before the Legislature Should Pass.

The Litigation Against the City, and the Necessity For Stopping It.

Opposition to the Providing of a Proper Sewer System.

A Crisis — Ald. Skinner Acknowledges That Should the People Defeat the Scheme a System Would Still Have to Be Built—Western Fair Legislation's Close Squeak.

The London City Council met last night to consider the City of London Bill.

All the aldermen were present; none stay away any more. The council went into committee of the whole, with Ald. Taylor presiding. The portion of the bill relating to the fixed assessment of the Grand Trunk passed without debate, but the Western Fair clause had what would be called a "close squeak," and it was only on the understanding that the council would reserve the pruning knife, for when the bylaw, and not the bill, comes before the council, that only five opposed it.

NO TROUBLE HERE.

Clause 1 provided for a fixed assessment of the Grand Trunk's city property at $275,000; also that the company should enjoy immunity from assessment except where directly benefited.

The clause was passed without debate, as also was clauses 2 and 3, which simply contained qualifications of the preceding clause.

Clause 4 provided for an extension of time from 30 years, as contained in the last Grand Trunk bylaw, to 40, as recently agreed upon between the city and company.

This clause also passed unanimously, but the next clause (No. 5), which asked permission to borrow $25,000 for Western Fair building purposes, met with opposition.

TO STRIKE IT OUT.

Ald. Garratt moved that the clause be struck out, and Ald. Parnell reminded him that the citizens had voted to borrow the money, and also that the buildings were needed in the interest of the Fair.

Ald. Marshall raised the point as to who would have the power to spend the money. Ald. Parnell had intimated that probably the buildings would cost less than the $25,000. The clause mentioned that the money would be expended under the direction of six members of the Fair board and the members of No. 2 committee, and Ald. Marshall wanted to know who had the controlling vote.

Ald. Cooper favored the clause, and moved its adoption.

Ald. Dreaney opposed it, because his ward repudiated it.

Ald. Bennet favored the clause, even though his ward was opposed to it, and he had been personally opposed also; but he concluded to stand by the will of the city as a whole, which he represented just as much as No. 5 ward.

In reply to a question from Ald. Powell, the mayor pointed out that by the clause it was permissive with the city to cut the issue of debentures down to $5,000, if necessary. But the mayor also intimated that Superintendent Hook told him that the new buildings would probably cost more than $25,000, and that the Fair Board would have to borrow some extra funds on their own account.

Ald. Skinner expressed his disapproval of the absence of a delegation of the Western Fair directors to state their case. He intimated that he would take pattern by his ward and vote against it.

Ald. Armstrong spoke strongly of the necessity of the new buildings and increased accommodations, and Ald. Garratt spoke vigorously against the clause, saying that in a few years residents would be clamoring to have the Fair grounds moved further out.

Ald. Powell explained again that after the bill had passed the House, the City Council, in passing the necessary bylaw, could limit the amount as much as was necessary.

This converted Ald. Skinner, who expressed his satisfaction.

Because of the same safeguard, Ald. O'Meara stated that he would not oppose the measure, although he favored placing in the act the exact amount requisite, which would be much better.

Ald. O'Meara asked the solicitor if the council restricted the amount in the bylaw to $15,000, the council could by other bylaw or bylaws expend the other $10,0000 also for Fair purposes.

The solicitor answered that they could.

Ald. Carrothers said that they were satisfied that things were not represented correctly when the Fair Board said they needed $25,000. He intimated that a surplus was dangerous, and that he would not vote until he knew just how much money would be required.

Ald. Parnell, while in favor of the clause, did not want to spend one cent more of the money than was absolutely needed. He said that if Secretary Browne and Superintendent Hook were not absent in Toronto they would doubtless have been present. He thought the difficulty could be remedied by stipulating in the bylaw that the first amount granted would be final.

Ald. Marshall said that in that case he would support the clause, but reserved the right to criticise the expenditure very closely when it again came before the council. He thought a time limit of two or three months could be allowed the Fair Board, after which time they could not have any more money.

Ald. O'Meara moved in amendment that $10,000 be the limit of the amount mentioned in the bill.

Ald. Parnell proposed a motion to limit the expediture to what should be first given, and Ald. Powell counselled caution, and intimated that the city was protected, in that the council could limit the expenditure to what it liked afterwards.

Ald. Garratt, Skinner and Carrothers emphasized the position they had already taken, and Ald. Cooper withdrew his amendment in favor of one by Ald. Parnell, in which it was agreed that if the Fair Board were once given $10,000 or $15,000 they could not afterwards come back and collect the balance of the $25,000.

Ald. Garratt's motion to strike out the clause only had five supporters, as had Ald. O'Meara's motion to restrict the amount to $10,000. Ald. Parnell's amendment carried.

IT COMMENCED HERE.

The sewerage legislation was then entered upon. The clause as read by the solicitor empowered the city to borrow $150,000 for sewer purposes, as well as to supplement it if necessary by $55,000 from the city's consolidated debt account.

Ald. Pritchard pressed his notice of motion that to borrow the amount without reference to the ratepayers would be "an unwarranted infringement upon the rights and prerogatives of the electors."

Ald. Parnell moved the adoption of the clause, and pointed out that owing to the present condition of the city sewerage system, the courts were practically standing with a club over the city's head. There was also a judgment which might be enforced against the city at any time. The question was not a debatable one, and the health of the public demanded a system of sewerage. It would increase the population and wealth of the city, as well as the health.

Ald. Skinner favored a reference to the people, although he had no doubt but that they could convince them that the expenditure was to a great extent necessary. He did not believe in being bound by any of the reports brought in by the engineer, and Ald. Parnell stated that he did not, either.

Ald. Cooper spoke in a similar strain. If the people said sewerage, the sooner they got it the better.

Ald. Garratt wanted the plan of the system to be printed and circulated. He referred to the heavy cost of previous reports, and went exhaustively into a description of several English systems of sewers. In the winter time the sewerage farm would not act, and the sewage would again run into the river.

Ald. Bennet intimated that while the stand taken by Ald. Skinner was seemingly a fair one, tenants would be debarred from voting for the bylaw. The health of the tenants was just as much at stake as those of property holders.

Ald. O'Meara said that when the bill had passed the House it did not mean that the whole amount should be expended, and he asserted that a good sewerage scheme could be had for less money. Unless the clause went to the House it would mean the delay of a whole session.

Ald. Pritchard said that if the plan outlined by the Board of Health was carried into effect the sewerage farm would be unsuitable during the winter months. He asked who had asked for "this star chamber legislation?" If a sewerage farm was really decided upon, the Elliot farm, two miles down the river on the north side was the only proper place.

ALD PRITCHARD CRITICISES.

"And now," said Ald. Pritchard, with a very grave demeanor, "I want to ask you, Mr. Mayor, is it a fact that you attended a meeting of the Council of the Ontario Government to impress on them the necessity of using their influence to pass this bill through the Legislature without the consent of the citizens of London for that purpose?"

"That is a question which I shall not answer," replied the mayor.

"Of course, I don't mean any discourtesy to you, Ald. Pritchard," he continued, "but it would be an improper question to answer."

"All right," said Ald. Pritchard, "I won't press you; but I hope there won't be undue pressure brought upon the Government."

Ald. Marshall brought Ald. Pritchard to task for repeatedly stating during his remarks that $250,000 was wanted for sewer purposes.

"Oh, it's a small matter," said Ald. Pritchard.

"Well, I know," said Ald. Marshall; "but you might just as well give it within $50,000 of being correct."

Continuing, Ald. Marshall showed that the city was in a peculiar position and placed under necessity by the courts, by injunction, to build a system of sewers, and in that case it would not be right to have the question defeated by the people, who are already bound by law to build a system. As to what the system should be, it lay with the council, and he would be the last one to expend one cent more than was absolutely necessary.

If the plan of filtration was followed, Ald. Garratt insisted that in winter the ground would not absorb the stuff and it would still run into the river, and the injunction was still there.

Ald. O'Meara said that the city would not by the legislation be confined to any system whatever. He was surprised at the attitude of the Conservative representatives of No. 4 ward, from which there were pigeon holes full of complaints anent the use of Carling's Creek in its present condition.

A QUEER POSITION.

Ald. Parnell asked Ald. Skinner, who was opposing the clause, what he would do if the ratepayers voted against the sewerage system, when the courts had already decided that a system had to be built.

Ald. Skinner said that in that case they would be obliged to go on with some scheme, but probably a less extensive one.

Dr. Cl. T. Campbell was called on, and said that the kind of system was not under discussion, but whether or not there should be a system at all. Even after the council had agreed upon a system, it would have to be sanctioned by the Provincial Board of Health.

"It may not be generally known," said the Board of Health's chairman, "that a few years ago, when judgment was given against the city for polluting the river, one of the Superior Court judges was about to issue an order to close up the sewers, and it was only upon the very strong protests of the city's member, who was then the city's solicitor, that the judge abstained from issuing the order.

"What position would you be in if the mouths of the sewers were shut up?" asked the doctor.

"Hang the judge," replied Ald. Powell.

"Well, you can do that. I have no objection whatever," said the doctor; "but why will you submit to the people a matter that is not at all optional? The courts have said 'You cease polluting the River Thames!' If you think it is advisable to ask the people whether they shall obey the mandate of the court, that is for you to say.

"I think myself that the estimate is excessive. They are the figures of the engineers—mainly of the city engineer—and they are the maximum of cost. I did not want to ask you to grant a minimum amount and then require more."

Ald. Powell, Cooper, O'Meara, Carrothers, Marshall and the mayor took part. Ald. Powell counselled delay; there was no hurry. Ald. Carrothers said that over $300,000 would be spent before they get through.

THE MAYOR SPEAKS.

The mayor explained that he had nothing to do with the initiation of the scheme personally; but because it had been suggested by heavy ratepayers who waited on him, as an absolute necessity. Several times in his official capacity as mayor the secretary of the Provincial Board of Health asked what the council was going to do. He said that the Attorney-General's department had been communicating with him several times to find out whether the order of the court respecting the pollution of the Thames was going to be carried out, and whether London was taking any serious steps towards removing the nuisance. The Provincial Secretary replied that he had been keeping back the execution of the judgment on the plea that London was going to take this thing up. Being of the opinion that they were compelled to do something, he brought the matter before the council last year. There was no option. The sewerage question had to be dealt with, and that at once. The city only had five months in which to remove the nuisance from Mr. Levi Lewis' property.

The mayor went fully into the details of the payment for the sewers by the ratepayers, and showed how it would be equalized so as to make the rate excessively burdensome to none.

The mayor reconsidered his answer to Ald. Pritchard's question, and said he had nothing to conceal. He had seen the Attorney-General on the question of sewerage. He made inquiries to see if there was no way by which the thing could be staved off. He then had a conversation with him on the subject generally. The Attorney-General had not stated that he would allow the bill to go through simply on the vote of this council. They would just have to take their chance.

In reply to Ald. Powell, the mayor further said that, seeing the question was not one for the people, the Legislature would insist on a two-thirds majority of the council before the money was expended.

THE DIVISION.

"Now, I am going to say this on my own responsibility," said Ald. Marshall. "I do not think we are ever going to have a system of sewers at all if we are going to have a division on lines of politics. If we get antagonistic to each other in the very commencement, I don't know where it will all end. We will have no sewers, I know that. I, for one, don't feel like asking the mayor by a casting vote to defeat or carry this clause. If there is no way of getting out of it without a tie vote, I would sooner not vote at all. We should try to get on some common ground, upon which we can work, and not get into trouble again."

"Have any members on this side of the house mentioned politics?" asked Ald. Pritchard, in indignation. "I contend that there has not been any politics in this discussion tonight."

"I am accusing myself just as much as I am accusing you," answered Ald. Marshall.

Then Ald. Douglass arose. "Mr. Chairman," said he, also with a rising and indignant inflection, "surely there are no politics in this?"

But the division which was then recorded was 9—3, as in the deadlock days.

"You can see the result," said Ald. Marshall. "Let us face this unfortunate position of affairs. There is no use mincing matters.

It was 11:30, and the aldermen evinced a desire to go home and finish the bill again. The committee rose and reported, and the mayor assumed the chair.

The choice of the meeting was a hard one. Ald. Carrothers could not come this afternoon; Ald. Nutkins could not come tonight, and Ald. Parnell could not attend Saturday night. Ald. Carrothers insinuated that Ald. Parnell would like to meet without him, and the mayor induced him, reluctantly, to withdraw, and finally it was agreed to resume at 9:30 this morning.

The report of this morning's session will be found on another page.

SHOWING HER FRENCH,

The other day I was at Montreal. As the inhabitants of this Canadian city are of French and English extraction, one part of of the population speaks French, the other part English Therefore, all the store signs and inscriptions at thoroughfares are written in both languages.

On our way to Lachine rapids our car stopped some time at a railroad crossing. Again the warning:

"Look out for the locomotive." And below, the French:

"Traversee de chemin de fer" (Lit: crossing of the railroad.)

"What a queer sort of people the French are," remarked the newly married lady to her husband; we say, "Look out for the locomotive,' and they say, 'Look out for the chimney of fire.'"

Your pains would go, and a ruddy glow
Your cheeks would know.
If you would take, (a note please make),
For health's dear sake,
The remedy that did for me
Such wonders great,
I beg to state

that Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription is the one thing that can and does cure the derangements of the female system. It is woman's great regulator. If every woman who suffers from diseases peculiar to her sex knew of its wonderful curative properties, a chorus of rejoicing would be heard throughout the length and breadth of the land, singing its praises. For nursing mothers and debilitated "run-down" women generally, it is the greatest restorative tonic and soothing nervine known. For those about to become mothers it is indeed a priceless boon. It lessens the pains and perils of childbirth, shortens parturition, promotes the secretion of an abundance of nourishment for the child and shortens the period of confinement.

Mr. Henry Tate has just given a most magnificent gift of £5,000 to Manchester College, Oxford.

DYSPEPSIA AND INDIGESTION.—C. W. Snow & Co., Syracuse, N. Y., write: "Please send us ten gross of Pills. We are selling more of Parmelee's Pills than any other Pill we keep. They have a great reputation for the cure of Dyspepsia and Liver Complaint." Mr. Chas. A. Smith, Lindsay, writes: "Parmelee's Pills are an excellent medicine. My sister has been troubled with severe headache, but these pills have cured her."

Sir Oliver's Stand

Against the Coercion of the Manitoba People.

The "Order" from Ottawa Treason to Canada.

Fair Play to the Minority and to All Parties Will Best be Obtained by Conciliation and a Full Investigation.

Toronto, March 6.—In the course of his speech in the Legislature, on the motion condemning the coercion of Manitoba by the Government at Ottawa, Sir Oliver Mowat said: I cannot imagine that there can be any doubt on the part of anybody but that it would be extremely unfortunate if the remedy for this alleged grievance were to devolve upon the Dominion Parliament instead of being provided for by the Manitoba Legislature. One thing, no act can be effectual if it is to be passed by the Dominion Parliament; it would be a most unfortunate thing that there should be a struggle on the part of the Dominion Parliament with the Manitoba Legislature and people. There is nothing that would be more dangerous, more to be objected to in every way, than a controversy upon this subject. Coercion would be resisted, but as the coercion contemplated relates to a matter of conscience, the objection to it is peculiarly serious. My honorable friend (Mr. Crawford, Conservative M. P. for West Toronto) said that there should be an inquiry, and that any remedial legislation on the part of the Dominion Parliament should be a last resort. I agree with him there, and I hope that the House generally will agree with him. * * * Then, again, it is not the people here, Protestants here or elsewhere outside of Manitoba, that are feeling most strongly upon this subject and are speaking most strongly upon it; this hasty action upon the part of the Dominion Parliament has been protested against by Manitoba and by its Legislature. The Dominion Government were extremely hasty in the matter. No sooner had the decision of the Privy Council been arrived at than they at once intimated to the Manitoba Government that its Legislature must retrace its steps. Nothing could have been more objectionable than that. They started something like coercion at the very first step. Manitoba was not prepared to retrace her steps; instead of their waiting for an opportunity for a change of public sentiment, the Dominion Government at once proceeded to pass a remedial order, practically requiring a restoration of the laws affecting separate schools, which the Manitoba Legislature had abolished. I cannot imagine anything more unstatesmanlike than that hasty course. I cannot imagine anything more treasonable to this country than such a course. I say the Legislature of Manitoba has protested against the hasty action which is proposed by the Dominion Parliament, and I shall read one or two sentences from Manitoba documents. They declare that "in amending the law from time to time, and in administering the system, it is their earnest desire to remedy every well-founded evil, and to remove every appearance of inequality or injustice which may be brought to notice." They also stated that "with the view of doing so, the Government and the Legislature will always be ready to consider any complaint which may be made in a spirit of conciliation." These are pleasant words, and give hope that if time were only allowed and conciliatory tactics adopted the difficulty would be removed. In view of these statements I propose asking the House to express the opinion that any proposal of remedial legislation by the Dominion Parliament should not be entertained until after the request of the Manitoba Legislature for a thorough investigation on the part of the Dominion of all the facts is acted upon, and all reasonable and proper efforts for conciliation have been made and have failed. I propose also to ask the House to recognize the fact that nothing should be done by the Federal Government nor by the Legislature with regard to separate schools during a period of excitement. As regards separate schools in Ontario, every bit of legislation we gave their supporters was approved by the whole Legislature and by the whole of the people at the time, and no objections were made to it until some years afterward. But if we had brought in any of this legislation at a time of excitement, of heated controversy as regards separate schools, it would have been most unwise. It is in the common interest that the matter should not be dealt with hastily. I agree with the resolution of my honorable friend so far as it asserts that the proposed action of the Dominion Parliament is fraught with grave danger to the interests of the Dominion as a whole, including the interests of the Roman Catholic minority, for whose benefit the proposed remedial legislation is designed.

Now I have given to the House the substance of the amendment which I propose to ask this House to adopt, and I hope that there will be a pretty general vote in its favor. The policy suggested in my resolution would be very valuable for the peace and harmony of our country, which are essential to our wellbeing. If there ever was a period when hasty action should be avoided, if there ever was a time when coercion should be avoided, it is the present. Events seemed not improbable lately, the prospect of which stirred up the patriotism of our people, which stirred up in us all a desire for a more hearty and more permanent union in this Dominion of Canada; the present is the very time when hasty coercion should not be thought of, and ample time should be given. If it be said that there is no object to be gained by a commission of inquiry as asked for by Manitoba, if that be the opinion of those who support the proposed remedial measure, there would at all events be no harm in such an inquiry. The Manitoba people are of opinion that there are important facts which should be laid before the commission in an authoritative way in order to enable all concerned to judge what ought to be done by the Manitoba Legislature or Dominion Parliament. The Dominion Government may not expect to learn any facts which they do not know already, but surely it is a monstrous thing to say that in a delicate matter of this kind they will not even hear what may be produced before a commission.

Prominent Lawyer Says.

"I have eight children, every one in good health, not one of whom but has taken Scott's Emulsion, in which my wife has boundless confidence."

Most people have in them some impulses of the bully, unless they are sick