

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING.

TERMS: THE DAILY COLONIST PUBLISHED EVERY DAY EXCEPT MONDAY... THE WEEKLY COLONIST...

ADVERTISING RATES: REGULAR COMMERCIAL ADVERTISING... TRANSIENT ADVERTISING... SPECIAL ADVERTISING...

THE PUBLIC HEALTH.

The Provincial Government Will Assist in Providing Means for its Preservation.

\$105,000 to be Expended on Sewers and Appliances for the Disposal of Garbage.

Proceedings at the Interview With the Government—A Sad State of Affairs Shown.

A deputation from the City Council, yesterday, waited upon the Government, at the Provincial Secretary's office.

Following is a verbatim report of the discussion: Hon. Mr. Davie—We received an intimation that a committee would wait upon us to discuss certain questions.

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of our visit is set forth in a resolution passed by the City Council, to the effect that a committee be appointed to wait upon the Government to consider questions relating to the Board of Health and its expenditure.

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—What do the Council intend to do in the future? I presume, in what you have already said, you refer to the smallpox epidemic of 1901.

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

Hon. Mr. Davie—The object of this deputation, then, is to discuss ways and means in respect of money already expended, or liabilities incurred?

in what condition the city is at present for an invasion of any contagious or infectious disease?

Ald. Styles—In a very bad condition, indeed. You see: All our street work has been stopped, and everything of that kind, and the Mayor has taken all the money, nearly appropriated for other purposes to pay the \$35,000 with. The city is in a very bad sanitary condition—very bad, indeed.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Let us understand what has been done and what can be done, so to place the city in a good sanitary condition?

Hon. Mr. Vernon—Tell us what is being done about the disposal of garbage, night-soil, etc.

Ald. Styles—There is absolutely nothing being done at present. We have \$10,000 voted for a crematory, but we are unable to obtain any site, and we have no funds to purchase a site, even if we could get one.

Hon. Mr. Vernon—That \$100,000 money raised by a by-law passed for a specific purpose?

Ald. Styles—Yes; to build a crematory. Hon. Mr. Turner—Do you think a crematory is a successful thing?

Hon. Mr. Turner—You think a crematory is a successful thing? It is very good for burning garbage, but will not burn night-soil successfully. From information I am able to obtain it is almost impossible to burn night soil.

Hon. Mr. Davie—The establishment of a crematory here would, then, be, in a measure, experimental?

Ald. Styles—Yes. Hon. Mr. Davie—Providing you had a site and could start to work at once, how long would it take before the crematory was in working order?

Ald. Styles—If a site was procured, it could be got in working order in three months. Hon. Mr. Davie—Has the Council taken, or do they contemplate taking any steps to improve the sanitary condition of the city in the three months it would take to build a crematory?

Ald. Styles—The Council is in rather a peculiar position. They have no place where they can dump garbage, except the old wharf out on the Dallas road. When that was running before, there was an injunction against it, and we had to stop using it. It has since been destroyed to a certain extent. There is a proposition now to repair the wharf; that is, a motion of this kind was brought up at the last meeting of the Council and it laid over. Some of the aldermen want to put it in working order, but there are really no funds on hand to do anything with now.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Do you not think that the best way to dispose of garbage and night-soil is to tow it out to sea?

Ald. Styles—That is a good idea. My idea is that Clover Point, where the sewerage dump is, would be a good place. I was speaking to Mr. Harris about it. He is the trustee of the Douglas estate, and I don't know if we could buy the property or not. We haven't any funds, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Davie—If the principle were established, that garbage, night-soil, and the like, should be towed out to sea, it would not be a difficult matter to find the requisite funds.

Ald. Styles—The easiest way would be to use Clover Point. Hon. Mr. Davie—A much better way would be to tow the stuff out to sea?

Ald. Styles—Oh, yes. Hon. Mr. Davie—As I said, the best plan is to tow this stuff about three or four miles out to sea in covers.

Ald. Styles—I would be in favor of building a chute at Clover Point. Hon. Mr. Davie—Do you know how they manage these things in England and in the other countries, where they have large and populous cities and no complete sewerage?

Ald. Styles—I think, in London, they run it out on the flats some way, and after a while it solidifies. Hon. Mr. Davie—I have been informed that the plan adopted in many cities is simply towing it a long way out to sea and dumping it.

Hon. Mr. Baker—That is by far the best plan. Hon. Mr. Pooley—That is the plan adopted on the Thames. There is a certain amount of garbage they cannot get rid of any other way. They tow it out in large scoops with false bottoms, which are so arranged that they do away with the objectionable features. They find that to be the most effective way.

Hon. Mr. Turner—The same thing, exactly, is done in New York. I wrote to the City Council about that 10 years ago, and gave them full particulars. Hon. Mr. Davie—They do that at Seattle.

Ald. Bragg—You must remember that in most English cities they have a system of sewerage. If we had a sewerage system here, we would do away with a great portion of the night-soil. Hon. Mr. Vernon—It will be some time before the sewerage system here can be completed so as to do away with the night-soil question entirely. In the meantime, what is the Council going to do? Have you arrived at any well-defined plan for the disposal of garbage, etc., or is it that the want of funds has prevented any action? If the Council had the money, how would they spend it?

Ald. Styles—I think, if they had the money, they would build a crematory, and build a wharf so as to dump the night soil. Hon. Mr. Davie—That is only what you think they would do?

Ald. Styles—Yes. Hon. Mr. Davie—Well, assuming that the funds can be arranged for, has the Council come to any conclusion as to what to do? Ald. Bragg—I might say that at the last meeting of the council, we had some discussion about Clover Point. The property cannot be purchased, it must be expropriated, and I intend to look into the matter, and bring a motion before the council to expropriate that Point.

Hon. Mr. Davie—If you adopted the plan of loading the stuff on the scoops and towing it out to the sea, there would be no necessity of using that Point? Ald. Styles—No.

Hon. Mr. Davie—It seems that we all agree that, to meet the present emergency, the best plan will be to adopt the scoop system. Ald. Styles—If we decided upon using scoops, we would have to buy a wharf and have to buy frongate, which we have not got yet. There might be some difficulty about that, as people would not want to sell property for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. Davie—There would be less trouble in overcoming than objections than there would be in overcoming objections to dumping the soil from a wharf. You would far easier get a frongate for a wharf for the scoops than a frongate to build a dump. There are objections to both, but the objections to the latter are by far the greater.

Ald. Styles—I don't know. Hon. Mr. Davie—Of course, there would be some objections, but they have met the same difficulty elsewhere and have overcome it, and there is no reason why we should not do the same here. The question to be discussed now, however, is if we should not adopt the same plan for Victoria. Assuming that it would be the best plan to adopt, and that the Council decided to

adopt it, what money would be required to obtain the necessary appliances, that is, scoops, steamer, and other modern appliances, to put the principle into operation?

Ald. Styles—I must confess we are not prepared with any such estimate. Ald. Bragg—I think the last council went into the matter of scoops, and afterwards abandoned the idea, so as to build a crematory; then they put a by-law before the people for funds to build the crematory, but in what I consider to be a very unbusinesslike way, neglected to provide a site.

Ald. Styles—I think about \$20,000 would be about enough for the purchase for the towing system. Hon. Mr. Turner—You can estimate on the amount it would cost to get a wharf, and to buy the scoops, you can easily hire a steamer; there are plenty of them around here now.

Hon. Mr. Davie—There are other things to get besides the scoops. You would have to consider the supplying of modern contrivances to cart the stuff away. They have contrivances which are used now—a-days which are obsolete.

Ald. Hall—They have those in Vancouver. Ald. Styles—In Europe all sanitary arrangements are under the control of the city.

Ald. Bragg—There is a clause in the "Health Act," that we could put in operation. I think, to compel the scavengers to use a cart to carry their stuff away.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Upon this subject of expense, Ald. Styles thinks that \$20,000 will be enough. That might or might not be sufficient. I think it will take more. However, we have put down \$20,000. At all events, the money is there, and it could be adopted immediately. It could be put into operation in a week or so.

Ald. Styles—A small tow-boat would cost about \$7,000, and then we would have to have two scoops and water frongate. Hon. Mr. Turner—At this season of the year there are lots of little steamers that could be had for a song.

Hon. Mr. Davie—It seems to be pretty well agreed that we ought to adopt the scoop system for Victoria. As we all seem to be agreed upon that point, there is another thing I want to ask about: That is, in regard to the sewerage system? It appears there was a by-law put before the ratepayers some short time ago to raise \$300,000, which was to be spent in extending the system. Now, how much would it take to complete the sewerage system so far as it has been opened without any extension? That is, to complete the trunk sewer so that it can be used?

Ald. Bragg—Two hundred thousand dollars of the by-law allotted to the ratepayers was for that purpose. The estimate was \$100,000, and it was thought advisable to raise it to \$300,000, on the ground that it would take that much to extend it and put in the sewerage system? Hon. Mr. Baker—They have provided in the by-law to make the side connections.

Hon. Mr. Vernon—What time did the Council think it would take to expend the \$300,000? Ald. Bragg—I don't know. The present contractor has till October 1st to complete his contract.

Ald. Styles—I think the sewerage matter is more in the hands of the commissioners than the City Council. Hon. Mr. Turner is one of those commissioners and can probably tell the Government more about it than we can.

Hon. Mr. Davie—First of all, it was contemplated that \$100,000 would be enough. What was that for? Ald. Bragg—It was to complete Mr. McBean's contract.

Hon. Mr. Davie—And the \$200,000 was for what? Ald. Bragg—To put in side connections for the whole area covered by Mr. McBean's first contract.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Then, as I understand it, from your Mr. McBean's contract, you take into consideration side connections? The by-law was for \$100,000 to complete the work, and \$200,000 for side connections?

Ald. Bragg—The time the by-law was before the Council first, it was only for extending the sewer, but what was the main trunk sewer without any connections? That was the question I asked, and Mr. McBean at the Mayor's request, made an estimate of the amount of money needed, and the by-law was then raised to \$300,000.

Hon. Mr. Davie—At what distance apart was it contemplated that side connections should be put in? Ald. Styles—Every forty feet.

Hon. Mr. Davie—So that \$200,000 was estimated to be the cost of side connections at every forty feet? Ald. Styles—Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Well take, for instance, the case of buildings like the Dried House; the frontage there is, say, 300 feet. According to the estimate that would take seven or eight connections? Ald. Styles—It is not intended in that light.

Hon. Mr. Davie—\$200,000 was to put connections in every 40 feet? Ald. Styles—But take the case of the block divided into different lots, each lot, say, a house built on each, and each house owned by a different man. Each lot would then have to have a connection with the sewer.

Hon. Mr. Davie—But how many blocks there are where that would be the case. For instance, take the "Five Sisters Block." You have \$200,000 provided for putting in the side connections at every forty feet. Now, if you take into consideration that every 40 feet of land along the sewer is not necessarily held by a different owner, and there need not necessarily be a connection every 40 feet, would not the cost be very much less?

Ald. Styles—I think the sanitary engineer has gone into all that. Hon. Mr. Davie—If the arrangement was for a side connection every 40 feet, the \$200,000 would be considered more than sufficient?

Ald. Styles—You see, it was this way: There was a "40" or a "50" or an "L" put in at every 40 feet, so that the main sewer would not have to be broken.

Hon. Mr. Davie—It is calculated now, however, that this work can now be done under the "Local Improvement System"? Ald. Styles—Yes.

Hon. Col. Baker—That is, that the owners will make the connections themselves, on the "Local Improvement plan"? Hon. Mr. Davie—Yes; so that the \$200,000 is no longer under discussion. All that you want now is the \$100,000 to complete McBean's contract.

Hon. Mr. Turner—Has not McBean's contract been cancelled, or something of the kind? Ald. Bragg—No; we have notified him to suspend work.

Hon. Mr. Turner—When that contract was given out, a certain area was provided for afterwards the Council, in 1888, or 1890, or 1891, changed the plan and had the sewers deepened, thereby causing the expenditure of more money. They came to the conclusion that they could not complete the same plan for Victoria, they reduced it to what is pretty nearly ready now. I thought the object of the Council

was to complete what was included in the contract. They can make what is already done, effective with a little more money than they have now. I think they can get it ready for work for about \$25,000 or \$30,000.

Hon. Col. Baker—Does that complete the contract? Hon. Mr. Vernon—It completes what was decided on at the meeting of the Council.

Hon. Mr. Turner—Could that \$100,000 you wanted be profitably expended before the end of this year? Ald. Bragg—I don't think so. We will see how it is in the winter; it could not be expended to advantage this year.

Hon. Mr. Davie—As a matter of fact, instead of \$100,000 being wanted, you only need somewhere about \$25,000 or \$30,000? Ald. Bragg—The \$100,000 that was in the by-law was to carry on and extend the system, and the \$200,000 was to cover the whole amount expended on trunk sewers. The \$200,000 would complete the area with side connections.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Then the \$100,000 is required to complete the present contract and extend the trunk sewer? Ald. Bragg—Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davie—What will it cost to complete the trunk sewer? I don't know, but I think it will be about \$25,000, and to put in working order what is at present under way.

Ald. Bragg—McBean has to complete his contract, and then we would have to map the whole system, but to put in working order what is at present under way.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Then you really don't want any money to complete the work? Ald. Bragg—No.

Hon. Mr. Turner—There are some things yet to be done that will cost about \$25,000. Hon. Mr. Davie—Well, say \$25,000. That will place the system, as far as it now goes, into good working order, and the side connections will be made on the local improvement plan. Then, what you really want is \$25,000 for sewerage, labor David William Toimie, six months, \$30,000 for scoops, etc., for the disposal of night-soil and garbage? We had put down \$20,000 for scoops, etc., but there is something more to be provided than those, so, say \$30,000, for scoops, etc., that amount to \$30,000. Is that all you want?

Ald. Styles—Yes; that would help us out. Ald. Bragg—If we had \$50,000 to pay the ratepayers, then we would have money for street work, etc., as the money that has now been taken away from the appropriations could then be used.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Well, we will call that \$30,000 for scoops, etc., and the present work before the sewerage system is put in, and the shape that you can dispense with the scoops, so there will be no money thrown away on them; besides the sewerage system will not be extended over the whole city. Now, these three amounts, \$25,000 for sewerage, \$30,000 for scoops, etc., and \$50,000 for street work, what is to prevent your putting a by-law before the people to raise that money? That would be the easiest way for you to get it.

Ald. Styles—Well, we had a little experience some time ago with some by-laws. We had some four or five of them put before the ratepayers, and not one of them carried.

Hon. Mr. Davie—I don't wonder at it. One of those, for instance, was for \$300,000, which money you admit now you don't want and don't need; \$100,000 was required for a hospital which few people thought was necessary, and \$75,000 was asked for health purposes without any particulars being given, and without the public being informed of how it was going to be spent. It is to my mind not at all remarkable that the by-law failed.

Hon. Mr. Davie—But, the present by-law is different. It is advisable to complete the sewerage system, and also to pay the small-pox bills, and it is necessary to put the city in a sanitary condition. I don't think there is any objection to that. The \$105,000 carrying. At some future time the ratepayers may be willing to vote more money to extend the sewerage.

Hon. Mr. Vernon—Next year they may. Hon. Mr. Davie—It seems to me that \$105,000 will be enough to keep the city clean. Ald. Hall—But we cannot put a by-law before the people for these purposes because of the defeat of the previous by-law.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Who says so? Hon. Mr. Baker—The Mayor says so. He showed me the clause in the by-law, and the by-law is clear enough in the "Municipal Act" that you cannot put a second by-law before the people the same year for the same purpose, after the first one has been defeated by a by-law proposed now, are not, for the same purposes, as the ones defeated.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Take, for instance, the sewerage by-law. The defeated one asked for \$300,000; \$200,000 for side connections and \$100,000 for health purposes. You have abandoned the side connections, or will have them done on the "Local Improvement System." You have also abandoned, for the present, the idea of extending the sewerage by-law to \$200,000. Now, if you take into consideration that every 40 feet of land along the sewer is not necessarily held by a different owner, and there need not necessarily be a connection every 40 feet, would not the cost be very much less?

Ald. Styles—But both are for the same purposes. Hon. Mr. Davie—That is certainly the general term; but we must bear in mind that the purposes for which you submitted the first by-law are about the same as the by-law to raise \$25,000 would be for an entirely different purpose. So much for the sewerage. Now, take the \$50,000 to raise money for payment of smallpox bills. Your last by-law asked for \$75,000 for general health purposes; you did not particularize. Now, you find that for the purpose of liquidating an incurred liability in connection with the smallpox outbreak you want \$50,000. Surely, that is for a different purpose.

Ald. Bragg—The Mayor says it is for the same purpose. Hon. Mr. Davie—Others may think differently. I might say that looking at the matter off-hand, it struck me, when that last by-law was before the people, that had it carried, it would not have been competent for the city to have paid one cent of that \$75,000 for smallpox bills already incurred.

Ald. Bragg—I differ there. I think the by-law men do not specifically say so. Hon. Mr. Davie—Well, that is the way it struck me at the time. That you could not have expended one dollar for liabilities already incurred, and would have had to provide for the payment of those bills in some other way.

Ald. Bragg—What if we brought the by-law up in the council and the Mayor refused to put it? You don't know the kind of a man we have to deal with. If we want to carry a point with him, we have to bring some plank with us, and sleep all night. You don't know how obstinate he is. There is no putting an alderman in the chair, or anything like that, for you can't fire him out.

Hon. Mr. Davie—After examining copy of the by-law to raise \$75,000 for health purposes? You see, this deals in general

terms; I don't think there will be any obstacle in putting the second by-law before the people. That is all very well for you to say, but if you knew the kind of a man we have to deal with you would find it difficult. The people who have to vote on the by-law have also got to be considered.

Hon. Mr. Davie—All you have to do is to deal with the people in a reasonable way. If you take them that way you will find that they are reasonable men. Well, now, I am inclined to think that there is no legal obstacle in the way of your putting that \$50,000 for smallpox purposes and, certainly, the \$30,000 by-law for scoops is entirely legal. It seems to me that there is no legal obstacle to any of them. However, as it is a legal question it would be just as well to take legal advice on the matter, and not take the issue directly of the Mayor or anybody else. Get an opinion, for instance, from the City Barristers or from Hon. Mr. Richards. If you are then advised that there are any obstacles in the way of any of the by-laws, I am inclined to think that the Government might come to your assistance and pass an Order-in-Council under the "Health Act," practically suspending clause 118. The Mayor, you are probably aware, is a very broad statesman, and authorizes the Government, in cases where there is a threatened invasion of epidemic, or endemic disease, to pass, practically, any law which may be deemed necessary, and such Orders-in-Council are subject to the assent of the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. Pooley—The only point would be that the Government would only have power to act in case of a threatened invasion. This \$50,000 is needed to pay past bills. Hon. Mr. Davie—Yes; but by paying bills incurred the money which has been utilized already for this purpose could be used for other health purposes, such as cleaning streets, etc., and the local improvement plan. Then, what you really want is \$25,000 for sewerage, labor David William Toimie, six months, \$30,000 for scoops, etc., for the disposal of night-soil and garbage? We had put down \$20,000 for scoops, etc., but there is something more to be provided than those, so, say \$30,000, for scoops, etc., that amount to \$30,000. Is that all you want?

Ald. Styles—Yes; that would help us out. Ald. Bragg—If we had \$50,000 to pay the ratepayers, then we would have money for street work, etc., as the money that has now been taken away from the appropriations could then be used.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Well, we will call that \$30,000 for scoops, etc., and the present work before the sewerage system is put in, and the shape that you can dispense with the scoops, so there will be no money thrown away on them; besides the sewerage system will not be extended over the whole city. Now, these three amounts, \$25,000 for sewerage, \$30,000 for scoops, etc., and \$50,000 for street work, what is to prevent your putting a by-law before the people to raise that money? That would be the easiest way for you to get it.

Ald. Styles—Well, we had a little experience some time ago with some by-laws. We had some four or five of them put before the ratepayers, and not one of them carried.

Hon. Mr. Davie—I don't wonder at it. One of those, for instance, was for \$300,000, which money you admit now you don't want and don't need; \$100,000 was required for a hospital which few people thought was necessary, and \$75,000 was asked for health purposes without any particulars being given, and without the public being informed of how it was going to be spent. It is to my mind not at all remarkable that the by-law failed.

Hon. Mr. Davie—But, the present by-law is different. It is advisable to complete the sewerage system, and also to pay the small-pox bills, and it is necessary to put the city in a sanitary condition. I don't think there is any objection to that. The \$105,000 carrying. At some future time the ratepayers may be willing to vote more money to extend the sewerage.

Hon. Mr. Vernon—Next year they may. Hon. Mr. Davie—It seems to me that \$105,000 will be enough to keep the city clean. Ald. Hall—But we cannot put a by-law before the people for these purposes because of the defeat of the previous by-law.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Who says so? Hon. Mr. Baker—The Mayor says so. He showed me the clause in the by-law, and the by-law is clear enough in the "Municipal Act" that you cannot put a second by-law before the people the same year for the same purpose, after the first one has been defeated by a by-law proposed now, are not, for the same purposes, as the ones defeated.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Take, for instance, the sewerage by-law. The defeated one asked for \$300,000; \$200,000 for side connections and \$100,000 for health purposes. You have abandoned the side connections, or will have them done on the "Local Improvement System." You have also abandoned, for the present, the idea of extending the sewerage by-law to \$200,000. Now, if you take into consideration that every 40 feet of land along the sewer is not necessarily held by a different owner, and there need not necessarily be a connection every 40 feet, would not the cost be very much less?

Ald. Styles—But both are for the same purposes. Hon. Mr. Davie—That is certainly the general term; but we must bear in mind that the purposes for which you submitted the first by-law are about the same as the by-law to raise \$25,000 would be for an entirely different purpose. So much for the sewerage. Now, take the \$50,000 to raise money for payment of smallpox bills. Your last by-law asked for \$75,000 for general health purposes; you did not particularize. Now, you find that for the purpose of liquidating an incurred liability in connection with the smallpox outbreak you want \$50,000. Surely, that is for a different purpose.

Ald. Bragg—The Mayor says it is for the same purpose. Hon. Mr. Davie—Others may think differently. I might say that looking at the matter off-hand, it struck me, when that last by-law was before the people, that had it carried, it would not have been competent for the city to have paid one cent of that \$75,000 for smallpox bills already incurred.

Ald. Bragg—I differ there. I think the by-law men do not specifically say so. Hon. Mr. Davie—Well, that is the way it struck me at the time. That you could not have expended one dollar for liabilities already incurred, and would have had to provide for the payment of those bills in some other way.

Ald. Bragg—What if we brought the by-law up in the council and the Mayor refused to put it? You don't know the kind of a man we have to deal with. If we want to carry a point with him, we have to bring some plank with us, and sleep all night. You don't know how obstinate he is. There is no putting an alderman in the chair, or anything like that, for you can't fire him out.

Hon. Mr. Davie—After examining copy of the by-law to raise \$75,000 for health purposes? You see, this deals in general

terms; I don't think there will be any obstacle in putting the second by-law before the people. That is all very well for you to say, but if you knew the kind of a man we have to deal with you would find it difficult. The people who have to vote on the by-law have also got to be considered.

Hon. Mr. Davie—All you have to do is to deal with the people in a reasonable way. If you take them that way you will find that they are reasonable men. Well, now, I am inclined to think that there is no legal obstacle in the way of your putting that \$50,000 for smallpox purposes and, certainly, the \$30,000 by-law for scoops is entirely legal. It seems to me that there is no legal obstacle to any of them. However, as it is a legal question it would be just as well to take legal advice on the matter, and not take the issue directly of the Mayor or anybody else. Get an opinion, for instance, from the City Barristers or from Hon. Mr. Richards. If you are then advised that there are any obstacles in the way of any of the by-laws, I am inclined to think that the Government might come to your assistance and pass an Order-in-Council under the "Health Act," practically suspending clause 118. The Mayor, you are probably aware, is a very broad statesman, and authorizes the Government, in cases where there is a threatened invasion of epidemic, or endemic disease, to pass, practically, any law which may be deemed necessary, and such Orders-in-Council are subject to the assent of the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. Pooley—The only point would be that the Government would only have power to act in case of a threatened invasion. This \$50,000 is needed to pay past bills. Hon. Mr. Davie—Yes; but by paying bills incurred the money which has been utilized already for this purpose could be used for other health purposes, such as cleaning streets, etc., and the local improvement plan. Then, what you really want is \$25,000 for sewerage, labor David William Toimie, six months, \$30,000 for scoops, etc., for the disposal of night-soil and garbage? We had put down \$20,000 for scoops, etc., but there is something more to be provided than those, so, say \$30,000, for scoops, etc., that amount to \$30,000. Is that all you want?

Ald. Styles—Yes; that would help us out. Ald. Bragg—If we had \$50,000 to pay the ratepayers, then we would have money for street work, etc., as the money that has now been taken away from the appropriations could then be used.

Hon. Mr. Davie—Well, we will call that \$30,000 for scoops, etc., and the present work before the sewerage system is put in, and the shape that you can dispense with the scoops, so there will be no money thrown away on them; besides the sewerage system will not be extended over the whole city. Now, these three amounts, \$25,000 for sewerage, \$30,000 for scoops, etc., and \$50,000 for