The Bill was left in Committee.

When the Women's Franchise bill passed its second reading in the house of assembly without a speech, except that of Mr. Graham, who fathered the bill, without a dissenting nay, or an assenting aye, and without emotion in the shape of the faintest applause, I characterized the proceedings as a fiasco. People not in the ken supposed the franchise was sure to be granted; those who knew the ways of politicians said they would take no chances on its ultimate passage, and these were right. What would have been the fate of the measure had it been sent to the legislative council is problematical, but the dear young and old chaps there were not given the chance to be denunciatory or appreciative. The bill met its fate in the place it first saw the light. What caused every member of the assembly, save the promoter, to sit mum, when the speaker put the question? What is chivalry? Was it a desire to say nothing harsh in the presence of the ladies who filled the gallery? Was it caution, in the form of a desire not to be too pronouncedly in opposition until a better idea of how the cat would jump could be obtained? Had the opponents of the bill, silent on the second reading, come to the conclusion that a vote to give the bill the three month hoist would not affect future prospects? It is hard to say. The whole performance shows what a funny thing is politics, and how many different ways there are of playing the game.

Mr. Tory, M. P. P.'s amendment to the Compensation act caused a good deal of discussion, somewhat gingery at times, and made the friends of the combined scheme uneasy for a while. The amendment was that the Dominion Steel and Dominion Coal companies should come under the act, whether the workmen wished it or not. The amendment was lost by only five votes and so close a vote on so important a subject, non-political, if such a thing is pos sible these days, was a little surprising. It was not a straight party vote, as far as the Liberals were concerned, as four or more did not vote with their leaders, but it was straight enough from a Conservative standpoint, as all the members of that denomination stood pat, except Mr. McInnes, who was excused from voting, as he is solicitor for the Dominion Coal company. Some of those favoring the Dominion Coal company's combined scheme think Mr. McInnes should have voted, but I think he acted prudently. With the knowledge in his possession Mr. McInnes could not have done other than voted for the scheme. Had he not done so would he not have given occasion for the opponents of the combined scheme, the U. M. W.'s to caekle. Of the debate it may be said that on the one side it was a fierce, a ferocious attack upon the Dominion Coal company, its ways, its works, and its management. and some very unparliamentary language was used in reference to the P. W. A. Politics, it is feared, is at the bottom of it all; both sides are jockeying for positions. That's about the size of it in the writer's

humble opinion.

Much peculiar legislation is sought for by cities

the plebiscite on the Workmen's Compensation Act. and towns. Here is the section of a bill promoted on behalf of the city of Halifax :-

> In place of ordering any premises to be vacated under this Section the Board may in its discretion declare such premises to be in an unsanitary condi tion and that no rent shall thereafter become payable by any occupant thereof until such unsanitary condition has been remedied to the satisfaction of the Board. Upon such declaration being made and served upon the owner, agent or lessee of the premises, no action, distress, or other proceedings for the recovery of any rent accruing after such declaration and before such unsanitary condition has been remedied shall be taken or be legal, nor shall any tenant be evicted or expelled for non-pay-ment of any rent claimed for such period, and in addition to any remedies or defences at law possessed by any person, any such owner, agent or lessee attempting to put in force any warrant of distress or to evict any such occupant for non-payment of any rent accruing for such period shall be liable to penalty not exceeding fifty dollars and in defaut of payment to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one month.

There are some amusing things said and done in the legislature. I will give an incident, rendered-all the more spicy when one considers that Mr. Finn is a M. P. P. for Halifax and Mr. Pearson connected with the Morning Chronicle. Mr. Finn had expressed his opinion on Mr. Pearson's veracity, to which that gentleman replied in these terms: would not seek Mr. Finn's opinion at any time, in any place, upon any subject. Now, I consider that a clean and clever, though not a kindly cut. Mr. Finn, a member of the committee, made no retort, but he had a champion.

When the House met, Mr. Butts rose to a question of privilege and discussed an incident at a public hearing before the Committee on Law Amendments which had concluded just before the House opened. Mr. Butts said that the Committee had been hearing the views on a Bill affecting the Nova Scotia Tramways and Power Co., Ltd., of a gentleman coming before the Committee either personally or in the interests of that company: All went smoothly interests of that company: All went smoothly until Mr. Finn, a member of the Committee, made some statement. Thereupon the gentleman referred to denied the statement made by Mr. Finn. The gentleman, said Mr. Butts, did not exactly say that Mr. Finn was a liar, but that he had lied. He, Mr. Butts, had called the attention of the Chairman of the Committee to the matter, but nothing was said and the Committee broke up.

Mr. Butts said that the House should not tolerate

a person who was before the Committee entirely at its pleasure to go before that Committee and call one of the members of the Committee a liar. Mr. Butts then moved that Mr. G. Fred Pearson be called before the Bar of the House and asked to apologize and regract his statement.

Premier Murray said that he did not see that the House could take notice of the matter. He did not think there could be any question of privilege in regard to a happening that took place before a Committee of the House, particularly when the House was not in session. If there had been any wrong