

Edinburgh and District Water Bill. St. Mary's Loch scheme. Speeches of Bailie Lewis, convener of works committee, Edinburgh and District Water Trust, at the meetings of town council, on 30th May and 1st June, 1871.

Contributors

Lewis David Magistrate of the City of Edinburgh.
Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh

Publication/Creation

[Edinburgh] : [publisher not identified], [1871]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/h7hkm99g>

Provider

Royal College of Physicians Edinburgh

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh. The original may be consulted at the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh. where the originals may be consulted.

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

EDINBURGH AND DISTRICT WATER BILL.

ST MARY'S LOCH SCHEME.

SPEECHES OF BAILIE LEWIS,

**CONVENER OF WORKS COMMITTEE, EDINBURGH AND
DISTRICT WATER TRUST,**

AT THE MEETINGS OF

TOWN COUNCIL, on 30th MAY and 1st JUNE, 1871.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b21723679>

R38811

SPEECHES OF BAILIE LEWIS,

CONVENER OF WORKS COMMITTEE, EDINBURGH AND
DISTRICT WATER TRUST,

AT THE MEETINGS OF

TOWN COUNCIL, on 30th MAY and 1st JUNE, 1871.

OPENING SPEECH.

AFTER the Clerk had read the memorial of the opposition from the meeting in the Music Hall,

Bailie LEWIS began by remarking that it was somewhat singular that they should be called upon to enter on another discussion of this water question, more especially when it was induced by those parties who complained so loudly of the waste of time in the former discussion of it; but it was now invested with certain features that made it assume a most interesting character. There was one thing in the case which he was glad at, and that was, that though he had been denied the opportunity of meeting the proposers and seconders of the resolutions now on their table, he would have the opportunity of replying to them now, though he should have preferred to do so elsewhere. He should, therefore, be as sparing of his remarks on the conduct of gentlemen who were not present as was consistent with the public interest; but he would endeavour to state pretty directly what he had to say regarding the use certain gentlemen, whom he was glad to see present, had made of his name in his absence. (Hear, hear.) With these remarks he would look with them at the speech of the distinguished chairman of the meeting from which this memorial had emanated. He regretted to say that this opposition had been characterised to a large extent by exaggerated statements and misrepresentation. (Cries of "No, no," "Quite right," applause, and hisses.)

The LORD PROVOST, addressing the public, said if that kind of interruption was continued the room would need to be cleared.

Bailie LEWIS said he liked to see the place crowded—(hear, hear, and applause)—because he believed in the instincts of the people,

if freed from the influence of prejudice, with which many were being deluged by the opposition. (Applause.) He had spoken advisedly and deliberately when he said the opposition had been characterised by misstatements. He found that Mr Cowan, chairman of this meeting, said it must be admitted as substantially true that the Water Trustees were a *packed* body. (Hear, hear.) If this were true, he would like to know who *packed* them. (Laughter and applause.) It was not the promoters of the bill; for on referring to their minutes they would find that Bailie Cousin, Councillors Methven, Howden, Wormald, Wilson, and Mitchell, all voted for the appointment of the Water Trustees, three weeks after they had published their report intimating their resolution to prosecute the bill during the present session. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Councillor METHVEN—I never voted for the St Mary's Loch scheme.

Bailie LEWIS would satisfy Councillor Methven and others on this point. When these Water Trustees were so appointed, it was known to every member of the Council that the Trustees had unanimously resolved—Convener Field dissenting—to go in for St Mary's Loch scheme, and during the present session too. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Mr Cowan ought therefore to prove his statement that the Trust was a *packed* body, or retract it and make an apology.

COST OF THE ST MARY'S LOCH SCHEME.

Again, Mr Cowan had said that he had been told on reliable authority, that whenever the bill received the Royal assent, the Trustees were prepared to enter into contracts which would involve an outlay of not £470,000, but £700,000. (Hear, hear.) Now, he (Bailie Lewis) had a right to ask—for the time had come when all those statements would need to be sifted, there or elsewhere—where was Mr Cowan's authority for this statement?

Bailie HOWDEN—Mr Leslie's report. (Hear, hear, and hisses.)

Bailie LEWIS—There was not a single syllable in Mr Leslie's report referring to the Trustees being prepared to enter upon an expenditure of £700,000.

Bailie COUSIN—It will not cost a penny less.

Bailie LEWIS said that was not the question. He wanted Mr Cowan's authority for the statement. (A Voice—"Send for him," and laughter.) How could such a statement be true, after it had been proved to the satisfaction of a most impartial tribunal of the House of Commons that the whole expenses would not exceed £500,000. It was truly painful—positively pitiable—to see gentlemen in Mr Cowan's position making such statements without a shade of evidence to support them, and deliberately subversive of the whole testimony laid before the Committee of the House of Commons; and he hoped Mr Cowan would have the generosity to withdraw the statement or submit the proof for it. No man knew better than Mr Cowan—for he was there every day, and heard the evidence of Mr Stewart, the evidence of Mr Bateman, and the clear, convincing, overwhelming

evidence of Mr Hawkshaw—that the sum submitted in the Parliamentary estimate was ample; and he asked how, in the face of that evidence—evidence which convinced the impartial tribunal of the Committee—he came down to Edinburgh and deliberately made statement subversive of the whole testimony?

QUALITY OF THE WATER.

Mr Cowan stated that the water of St Mary's Loch was a peaty water, coming from a wilderness of peat-hags—(laughter)—and it was unquestionably a very inferior water. Let them compare this statement with a letter of Mr Cowan's, dated 28th February, and there would be encouragement for the promoters in so doing. (Hear, hear.) In that letter (which Bailie Lewis here read) it was stated by Mr Cowan that the quality of the water was the weakest point in the opposition—(applause and laughter)—and more than that, that the water of St Mary's Loch was suited for domestic use. (Applause and slight hisses, and a voice—"He knows better now.") Yes; his faculties of belief appeared very convenient. But why had he changed his opinion? Instead of writing bitter attacks and personal recriminations, would it not be more honourable and respectable if he would give a reason for the faith that was in him now, as contrasted with the faith that was in him in February? Where was the reason for Mr Cowan changing his mind? (Hear, hear, and a voice—"See the evidence.") He would look at the evidence led before the Committee, and quoted the evidence of the professional gentlemen who had spoken to the good quality of the water—gentlemen of the highest authority as water-supply engineers, medical men, and chemists. As engineers they had Messrs Bateman, Stewart, and Leslie; as medical men they had Professor M'Lagan and Drs Alexander Wood and Littlejohn; and as chemists they had Drs Stevenson and Frankland, the most distinguished analytical chemists in the empire. Here, then, was an overwhelming flood of evidence, all of which had gone to shew that the water of St Mary's Loch was perfectly suited, both as to quality and quantity, for supplying Edinburgh, Leith, and Portobello, and that if the scheme was carried out, they would have one of the best water supplies in the United Kingdom. (Loud applause.) They were told they had conflicting evidence. Some went from this city and entertained the Committee with fine stories about water fleas and water scorpions, but these were treated as a joke; and with the exception of the evidence of Dr Letheby and the other chemist who succeeded him, the whole thing was treated as exceedingly superficial. Dr Letheby said the water was soft. He produced a set of beautifully-constructed tables, showing that wherever there was soft water there were high bills of mortality, and wherever there was hard water there were low bills. He was asked if he had not previously given evidence which shewed that hard water was associated with high bills of mortality, and soft water with low bills. Dr Letheby's evidence, therefore, may be regarded as *nil*, as he was obliged to admit that he was apparently

contradicting himself. (Laughter.) That was precisely the case before them.

BAILIE COUSIN'S REASONS FOR CHANGING HIS OPINION.

Coming now to Bailie Cousin's action in connection with the opposition, he said they understood each other, and he knew the Bailie would excuse him, and be the last man to object to his dealing with his arguments. (Bailie Cousin—"Hear, hear," and laughter.) At a meeting in Brighton Street Chapel, on the 22nd February, when they were both present, Bailie Cousin, as was reported in the newspapers, spoke of the various topics connected with the scheme, referring to the deficiency of water, the necessity for taking it out of the hands of the Company, and the comparative merits of the rival schemes, after which he went on to show that Mr Bateman's testimony on the St Mary's Loch scheme was thoroughly reliable, and that several eminent contractors had offered to take the works under the estimates then made out. He (Bailie Cousin) also admitted that the St Mary's Loch scheme might cost more money than was expected, which he was not certain of, however; though of one thing he was certain, namely, that the scheme would give them three times the supply they could get from the Heriot or the Esk. (Hear, hear.) It was very much in consequence of such a testimony, coming from a man in whom he had such implicit confidence, that Bailie Lewis was led to go on in the course that had brought him to his present position. At length the turning point came. In the bill of 1869 there is a provision that the sanitary rate of 1d. per pound should be wholly paid by the tenant, contrary to the custom in most other large towns; but the Trust had agreed that, in this bill, the sanitary rate would be levied more justly by the landlord and tenant paying an equal share of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. each per pound, against which resolution Bailie Cousin dissented, and pledged himself on that account to oppose the bill. (Hear, hear. Bailie Cousin—"Quite true.") He put it to the Council if it was fair that, because the Trustees had done what was fair justice between man and man, a gentleman who had hitherto led them on should, because of the miserable halfpenny that was to be laid on him as a landlord, turn against the bill? (A voice—"Quite true.")

Bailie COUSIN—State my reasons.

Bailie LEWIS said that was the only reason he had ever got from Bailie Cousin, and the only reason the Trust had got. He had been intensely grieved that a gentleman of Bailie Cousin's judgment and intelligence and reputation should have changed his position in consequence of such a wretched, miserable consideration. (Hear, hear.) Passing on to speak of Bailie Cousin's speech at the Music Hall meeting, he said that gentleman had passed something like a vote of censure on the Committee. A statement was made practically amounting to this, that the decision was contrary to evidence. Now, had he (Bailie Lewis) been associated with the opposition, he could not have conceived anything better calculated to damage that opposition than the resolution proposed by Bailie Cousin. In support of it the Bailie

said that the St Mary's Loch water acted powerfully on lead, and therefore was not the water to introduce into the city. But Dr Frankland said that the water could be safely transmitted through lead pipes and stored in lead cisterns. He said he knew the Loch Katrine water, and should say, roughly speaking, that that water acted one hundred times more upon lead than the St Mary's Loch water, and yet it was not found to cause any inconvenience in Glasgow. In answer to this, the opponents called a medical gentleman from Glasgow, whose name he (Bailie Lewis) had never heard of, and he told them that he had found a young woman, twenty-two years of age, who, in consequence of drinking water from some cistern, had suffered from colic and pains in the abdomen. Lord Bury asked what that had to do with the evidence, and immediately the young gentleman from Glasgow made his exit. (Laughter, and a voice—"Very good.")

Bailie MILLER—I think it is very bad; it showed that the Chairman did not know what he was investigating. (Cries of "Shame.")

MR COWAN AND THE WASTE WEIR AT GLENCORSE.

Now he came to a point that concerned the citizens more than himself—this was the waste of water alleged to take place at the Pentland reservoirs, referred to in the second resolution. Would they believe that he now stated, on the authority of Mr Cameron, who had been associated with the water supply for a long series of years, that from the month of March, 1869, up to the month of April, 1871, there was not an ounce of water overflowed the Glencorse reservoir. (Hear, hear.) And why? Simply because there had not been a sufficient rainfall to fill the existing reservoirs. If that was true, what about the question of waste? And he explained this, not by the fact that there was an additional quantity of water in 1871, but because the embankment had been tampered with, and tampered with after the whole works were handed over by an Act of Parliament to the citizens. (Hear, hear.) What would the citizens think when they came to know that between the time these works were handed over by the Act of Parliament, and the time when they came into the hands of the city, the embankment had been tampered with and lowered twelve inches? (Cries of "Shame," and "It is not true.") It might be said this was not true, but he was not there to speak without proof of what he said. When he went out to Glencorse, as convener of the Works' Committee, to see that these works were handed over in a proper condition, he found that a log of wood, of about twelve inches square, had been removed from the top weir, and strong iron stanchions were torn out from the stone to prevent any such beam being again placed there. (Hear, hear, and applause.) He went to the manager and asked why the log had been removed. The manager said he had done this with great reluctance in obedience to Mr Ramsay's orders. It was then the duty of the Works' Committee to inquire into this affair, when it was discovered that it had been done in consequence of representations made by Mr Charles

Cowan. ("Oh, oh," "Hear, hear," and hisses.) An inquiry was then made, when the books and papers of the Company were handed to the Trust, and a holograph letter of Mr Cowan found, dated 12th June, 1860, wherein he entered into an arrangement with the Water Company to allow them to put on this log of wood, to remain in perpetuity for the yearly rent of ten guineas, payable at Whitsunday. (Applause.) He had been out at Glencorse the other day, and there learned from the manager that in the interval between the time when Mr Ramsay gave notice to have the log removed and the time it was removed, he (the manager) had been repeatedly visited by one of Mr Cowan's sons, importuning him to take it off. Did all this not appear something like an explanation of the conduct of the opponents in recently going up to London, and as patriots trumping up a case about the amount of water wasted at the Pentlands, in consequence of which they had come forward to save the citizens by endeavouring to prevent them getting a supply anywhere else. (Cries of "Shame," and "hear, hear.")

Mr WORMALD—Read the correspondence.

Bailie LEWIS said he had it by him, and might have to read more of it when he came to reply.

Mr METHVEN—Has there been any communication from Mr Cowan? It would be very important to have it.

Bailie LEWIS said they had the original document signed by Mr Cowan himself, declaring that he allowed them in perpetuity, for ten guineas a-year, to raise the embankment 12 inches. It was wonderful how the evidence had been made to fit in with the removal of this log.

THE PENTLAND SCHEME.

Coming next to speak of the evidence led by the opposition before the Committee, he would first call attention to Mr Hawksley, who went into the witness box and told a fine story, to the effect that four million gallons of beautiful water might be saved by a very limited expenditure from the Pentlands—for about £100,000 an additional supply of four million gallons could be got. And yet the same gentleman told them previously that it would take £60,000 to bring into the city every additional million gallons. The committee then wanted more evidence, and Mr Leslie was recalled. He stated that he had read Mr Hawksley's evidence, but could not agree with what was there stated, and thought it was pure hallucination on the part of Mr Hawksley to state that so much water could be gathered from the Pentlands. (Hear, hear.)

Councillor WORMALD.—What about the water register?

Bailie LEWIS.—It was stated on oath by Mr Leslie that the water-register was of no use, because of its inaccuracy. This would be seen as they approached the evidence of Mr Hawksley. (Hear, hear.) He then read from reports of Mr Leslie, engineer, Mr Ramsay, manager, and Mr Graham Bell, chairman, of the Water Company, all of whom concurred in stating that the Pentlands were practically exhausted, and

shewed that, so far back as 1866, they were all agreed that the next supply of water for the city must be found elsewhere than in the Pentlands. Even Mr Hawksley, in 1869, recommended the Moorfoot scheme, after the Company had abandoned the Pentlands.

Councillor WORMALD—Why was it never produced?

Bailie LEWIS—Mr Cameron was at the table before the Committee with the book, ready to be produced.

Councillor WORMALD—I deny it.

Bailie LEWIS—You may deny what you please, but I refer you to the printed evidence. When it is kept in view that it has cost about £500,000 to bring in seven million gallons from the Pentlands, any one will see the absurdity of Mr Hawksley's proposal to bring in four million gallons at £100,000, even were the water there, which Mr Ramsay and Mr Leslie tell us it is not. In fact, Mr Leslie told the Committee in London that not only was the story of Mr Hawksley about four million gallons running over the waste-weir at Glencorse not correct, but that four million gallons was more than was there altogether, including compensation to millowners, and what came into the city. Hence the ridiculous story about the Pentland scheme. This was made clear to the Committee, who, not satisfied with Mr Hawksley, wanted more evidence, and Mr Leslie was recalled. He stated that he had read Mr Hawksley's evidence, but could not agree with what was there stated. To him it appeared a pure hallucination on the part of Mr Hawksley to state that so much water could be gathered from the Pentlands. In short, he told them that after the peaty water and the compensation which they would be compelled to give was deducted, he did not see how any additional supply could be obtained from that source worthy the consideration of the citizens, and which would at all justify the expense. Moreover, Mr Leslie and Mr Ramsay had reported to this effect many years ago. (Hear, hear.)

BAILIE HOWDEN'S CHARGE AGAINST THE EVIDENCE OF BAILIE LEWIS.

In passing to the gross and libellous charges preferred against him by Bailie Howden, he should not shock the Council by reading the language as reported in the account of St Stephen's Ward meeting. He preferred to devote the time at his disposal to reply to the statements complained of. He then proceeded to notice Bailie Howden's remarks on the evidence he had given before the Committee, and would just say, that if the statements of Bailie Howden were true, he (Bailie Lewis) should not be allowed to sit in that Chamber for another hour. Bailie Howden had asked, "Who is Bailie Lewis?" But he would ask, "Who is Bailie Howden?" (Laughter.) Bailie Lewis was an individual who had lived in an honourable calling by the labour of his hands up to the present hour. Bailie Lewis might not be the richest—he might be the poorest—in that Chamber, but he would yield to no man for honour and integrity of purpose. He had been among the citizens for five-and-twenty years as an honest tradesman.

Was there anything in his being a tradesman of which he needed to be ashamed? Was there a man, or a woman, or a child that had suffered by reason of the profession by which he lived? Could Bailie Howden look back for the last five-and-twenty years and say the same in regard to the trade in which he had been so long engaged? ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) This was a grave matter. If Bailie Howden could not prove his assertions, he ought, if there was one spark of gentlemanly feeling about him, to retract and make a humble apology. Bailie Howden practically said that Bailie Lewis had gone before the House of Commons' Committee and given false evidence. Had he listened to the advice he had received from some of his friends, he would have taken some means of dealing with that statement elsewhere, but he preferred rather to submit the case to his brother councillors, and allow them to judge it. His evidence was to the effect that, instead of having a petition signed by 14,000, he gave it as his opinion that if the same time had been employed by the promoters, they could have had a petition signed by upwards of 40,000 ratepayers; and Bailie Howden asked how, as there were only 35,000 ratepayers in the three burghs, the promoters could get 40,000 out of that number. To that he would reply that Bailie Howden's assertion as to the number of ratepayers was not true.

Bailie HOWDEN—Sir, I got my figures from a competent authority, Mr Cameron.

Bailie LEWIS—I shall prove to the contrary. He then read a letter from Mr Cameron, stating that he told Bailie Howden that he could not give him the number of ratepayers, seeing that many landlords paid for a large number of their tenants, obtaining only one receipt. Accompanying the letter from Mr Cameron there was, in illustration, a list which Bailie Lewis produced, giving the names of 71 landlords or factors who had paid for no fewer than 5529 tenants. This fact alone showed the value of the testimony upon which Bailie Howden dared to impugn his veracity. What, he asked, were the Council and citizens to think of the conduct of Bailie Howden? (Hear, hear.)

Bailie COUSIN—It seems to me there is some little misunderstanding.

Bailie LEWIS—I will clear up the misunderstanding before I am done. He went on to say that he had procured returns from the assessors of the three burghs, showing that the number of ratepayers in Edinburgh was 45,209; in Leith, 10,439; and in Portobello, 1304—total, 56,952; and he asked if he was not entitled to believe that 40,000 could have been got to sign out of 56,952. It was important to mark here that he only expressed it as a matter of opinion, and did not affirm it, as stated by Bailie Howden. It might be asked, Upon what ground did he base such an opinion? In view of the fact that the question had been before most of the Ward meetings without an expression of dissent, and seeing that the Town Council had re-elected the Trustees three weeks after they had reported their resolution to prosecute the Bill in the present session of Parliament, he considered that he was perfectly entitled to express the opinion which

he did. (Hear, hear.) Yea, more, he had no hesitation in saying, but for the gross misrepresentations and exaggerations of those interested in getting up the opposition, such would have been the state of public opinion still. But they had been told that 14,000, who had signed for the opponents, must be deducted. Will any one believe that all those who signed against the Bill would have done so had a petition been hawked about in its favour? But what was the fact as to the opposition petition? Why, it was found that it bore the names of people over and over again repeated, and whole sheets positively written by one hand. More than that, Provost Watt and Councillor Archibald, of Leith, deponed that they called on numbers of those who had signed the petition, and found that these people had been induced to do so by misrepresentations as to the cost of the scheme and the quality of the water. Why, if he had believed it would cost a million of money, he would have opposed it too; but when would he have opposed it? He would have opposed it at the proper time, before he had voted in Trustees to prosecute it, before thousands of pounds had been spent upon it, and before it had been submitted to an impartial tribunal of the House of Commons. He had no hesitation in saying that the threatened opposition in the House of Lords would ultimately end in smoke. (Hear, hear.) He believed that no other gentleman in the room would have treated him and the promoters of the Bill as Bailie Howden had done, and Bailie Howden must just take the consequences of his own act.

Bailie HOWDEN—I am prepared for that.

BAILIE HOWDEN ON PICKINGS.

Bailie LEWIS (continuing) said that, at St Stephen's Ward meeting, Bailie Howden spoke of the "pickings" to be got by Councillor Murray, Bailie Skinner, and others in the prosecution of the scheme. If there was one thing he (Mr Lewis) regarded as contemptible, it was the talk got up even by a Magistrate of the city in regard to men who had to leave their business for many long weeks on the affairs of the city. But if reference was made to "pickings," he would ask, did not Bailie Howden go to London to give evidence against the citizens in 1869? Did he not take his stand at that table, and solemnly swear to be faithful to the public interests, and afterwards, at the request of the Water Company, go to London and give evidence against the citizens? On his return to Edinburgh, he presented an account at the Water Company's Office for £83, 4s., after he had given evidence as a witness for the Ratepayer's Association; and I find that on 23rd June he received £75 in payment of his fees and expenses to London in opposition to the Bill. I ask, is that your signature? Is that the man to talk about "pickings?"

Bailie HOWDEN—Yes, it is my signature; and I gave a discount on my account, which is more than you did; and I can tell you further, that Mr Murray's account came to more than mine.

Bailie LEWIS—When Bailie Howden received four guineas a-day for his services, he could well afford to give a liberal discount.

(Laughter.) But this is not all. Here is another receipt dated the present month, for which there is a draft upon the funds of the Corporation for £20; and for what? for going to see the Queen. (Laughter.) And this is the man who talked of "pickings!" (Laughter and hisses.)

Bailie HOWDEN—I was ornamental if not useful. (Laughter.)

Bailie LEWIS—My Lord, that is a matter of opinion, and it is exceedingly questionable—exceedingly questionable. (Great laughter.)

EVIDENCE OF COUNCILLORS WORMALD AND MUIRHEAD.

Having thus disposed of the charges against the evidence of the promoters, let us look for a moment at the evidence of the opposition. Let us take as samples the evidence of Councillors Wormald and Muirhead upon the state of public opinion in the city, and mark this is before these last misrepresentations have been published anent the casting vote of the chairman, and their reflections against the Commons' Committee. Well, then, let us hear Councillor Wormald. What does he say? He said he had a difficulty in finding any body who does not entertain an opinion against the Bill, except the members of the Water Trust. Let us next hear Councillor Muirhead, who, be it observed, like Councillor Wormald, spoke upon oath. He said that he had both privately and in the course of his business an opportunity of meeting a large number of the members of the Edinburgh community, and they were all of them against it, except the members of the Water Trust in the Town Council. What I ask, my Lord, are you to think of evidence such as this? What does Bailie Howden think of it? and in what language is he prepared to characterise it? What will these two representatives of public opinion say before the Lords, if they have courage again to appear? When they are asked who moved in support of the bill in St Stephen's ward, and when it is wrung from them in reply, Mr Carment, president, Solicitors' Society, and Dr M'Donald, a distinguished and rising physician, how will this coincide with their former testimony? When asked, who moved in support of the bill in St Luke's, and they are compelled to answer, Dr Moir, and Sir Walter Simpson, son of the late distinguished Professor of the University—when asked, who moved the amendment in Newington, Mr Muirhead's ward, and again the answer, Rev. Professor Kirk, and Mr Josiah Livingstone, Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce—when asked, who moved in St Bernard's Ward, and they are constrained to confess, Mr Balleny, a most distinguished citizen, and Mr Ewart, one of the most extensive and enterprising builders in the city,—and when asked, who moved in St Giles' Ward, and they are again compelled to give the names of Mr Bone and Mr Adair, two most respected and well-known citizens, what must the Committee think of the value of such conflicting evidence? Surely, my Lord, if anything is wanted to open the eyes of the Lords to the character of the opposition, it is amply supplied out of their own mouths. Mr Cowan, in his first letter after the passing of the bill, sought to impose upon the

community, by making them believe that the bill was only carried by the casting vote of the Chairman. Next he issues a begging letter, stating that the bill only passed by a majority of the Committee. The three Provosts authoritatively condemn this statement. Mr Cowan, in his next letter, says that Parliamentary Committees are so conducted that no man can tell whether they are unanimous or not. Then, query, How does he come to say that they were not unanimous? How does he dare, confessedly, to seek to raise money from credulous citizens by stating that which, upon his own shewing, is an unwarrantable allegation? Surely if his opposition can only be promoted by such discreditable shifts, the sooner it is abandoned the better. (Applause.)

SPEECH IN REPLY.

Bailie LEWIS rose to reply at the close of this protracted discussion, but in doing so he should not listen to any suggestions to be short, neither should he endeavour unnecessarily to be long. This was a question of right or wrong with him, and therefore there would be no vacillation, no hedging for excuses, or indistinct utterances in his course concerning it. (Hear, hear.) There had been much said that day of a personal character, all of which he had fully weighed, and some of which would be touched upon in his remarks, and some of it, for the sake of those that uttered it, he would overlook.

COUNCILLOR DURHAM.

Coming first to Councillor Durham, who had complained of the reiteration of statements and arguments, he said it was quite necessary that certain statements ought to be reiterated until replies were made to them, and, if another party continued again and again to give utterance to incorrect statements, he would ask them if there was any course left but that of replying to these statements, although they had previously been replied to. (Hear, hear.) As an illustration of this, he referred to the fact that when Mr Cowan came down from London, he had presumed that the decision of the Committee had been come to by the casting-vote of the Chairman, and informed the public accordingly. He might ask the Lord Provost if this was correct, and knew he would answer it was not, and they would find that the three chief magistrates of the united Corporations continued to repudiate that statement, and stated that the decision of the Committee had been unanimous. Yet, in the face of that statement, the misrepresentation to the contrary was reiterated and repeated. That morning they found that Lord Bury had given his consent to those gentlemen informing the citizens that the Committee were unanimous. (Applause.) Surely he was entitled to reiterate such a statement in reply to Mr Cowan's assertion. Councillor Durham had also said he had read all the evidence, and cited portions of it to shew

that Dr Letheby considered that soft water was prejudicial to health, and raised the bills of mortality where it was used; but Dr Letheby's evidence, on the contrary, shewed that while Birmingham was supplied with perhaps the hardest water of any town in England, and Sheffield had nearly the softest, the death-rate was higher in the latter town by about 2 per cent. only, and Dr Letheby expressly stated that he did not think the water had anything to do with that. In the face of that he would ask them if it was not clear and palpable, from the evidence even of the witnesses for the opposition, that soft water was not prejudicial to health? (Hear, hear.)

BAILIE MILLER.

Passing on to Bailie Miller, who stated in reply to a statement of his that Mr Cowan's estimate of the cost was three-quarters of a million instead of a million, as he (Bailie Lewis) had stated——

Bailie MILLER said he was entitled to make an explanation. What he replied to at the commencement of his speech was an argument used by Bailie Lewis in reference to what Mr Cowan had stated at a meeting in the Music Hall, and they were not entitled to refer to other statements than the one Bailie Lewis had referred to.

Bailie LEWIS asked them to allow Mr Cowan to be his own witness. In the evidence they would find that Mr Dennison put a question——

Bailie MILLER—I repeat again, that what Mr Cowan then said is not before us.

Councillor HOPE—That is fairly out of order now. We must have Bailie Miller to sit down and not interrupt the speaker.

Bailie MARSHALL—I really think these “grave and reverend seigniors” should let Bailie Lewis go on. (Laughter, and Hear, hear.)

Bailie LEWIS said it surely was reasonable enough to hear Mr Cowan's own statements. Mr Dennison asked Mr Cowan if he presided at the meeting of the opponents to this bill, to which Mr Cowan answered that he did. The question was then asked—Did you tell the meeting that the St Mary's Loch scheme, instead of costing £500,000 would cost double that sum, or about a million? to which Mr Cowan answered, unreservedly, that he did say so. (Hear, hear.) Then, again, Bailie Miller made a statement regarding Mr Bateman's estimate for Loch Katrine works to the effect that, while the original estimate was only £570,000, the sum which it actually cost closely approached one million pounds. Well, was this true? (Cries of “No” and “Yes.”) Mr Bateman, in his evidence before the House of Commons, stated that his original estimate was £570,000, the amount of the tenders received for the execution of these works was £549,000, and the actual cost £690,000. (Cries of “Hear, hear.”) Now, unless they were prepared to say Mr Bateman had made a deliberate misstatement while on his oath, they must accept this statement as conclusive. (Hear, hear.) Bailie Miller also stated that the overflow of 4,000,000 gallons at Glencorse reservoir had been sworn to not only by Mr Hawksley, but corroborated by Mr Leslie. But it was quite

clear from the evidence that Mr Leslie did no such thing, and even contradicted it by saying there were no more than 4,000,000 gallons could be got out of the reservoir altogether, both for compensation and town supply.

Bailie MILLER rose to order.

Councillor HOPE—Down, Bailie Miller. (Laughter.)

Bailie MILLER said that Bailie Lewis—

Councillor HOPE—Down, Bailie Miller. (Laughter, and cries of “Order.”)

Bailie Miller still attempted to speak, but after receiving another injunction from Councillor Hope to sit down, he submitted, amid great laughter.

Bailie LEWIS resumed, and said the fact that there was so little water in these Pentland reservoirs was well known to those who inquired about it. Bailie Miller pointed to the apparatus as the cause of the deficient supply. He had went over and over again into the houses in the Old Town, and found that while those in the first and second flats were well supplied with water, the families in the third and fourth flats had none. The reason of this was simply owing to the want of pressure in the mains to send the water to the elevation necessary. (Hear, hear, and a Voice—“Quite right.”) More than that, he had gone out to the reservoirs at the Pentlands, and walked over them dry-shod, there being not a gallon of water in them; and when this was the case, they surely might not expect to find any water in the cisterns in the town. (“Hear, hear,” and applause.) The matter was simply this, unless they had a constant supply they would always have difficulties. Next Bailie Miller brought a charge against the promoters, whom he called the pretended friends of the working classes, to the effect that they wished to pass this bill to raise the rates from 4s. to 5s.; but he (Bailie Lewis) would ask them if there was anything unreasonable in this? If the inhabitants were to have a superabundant supply of water instead of a scanty supply, was it unreasonable that they should charge 1s. more for the superabundance? The accusation appeared to him most unreasonable, and it shewed to what extremities men were driven when they could not find a better argument against the promoters. (Hear, hear, and hisses.) He believed they would find no class in the city who would for a moment refuse to give 1s. more of a water rate in order to have an abundant supply. If he knew anything of the working classes, he believed they would rather pay 1s. for abundance of water for domestic and sanitary purposes and public works, than 8d., and continue to suffer on with a stinted supply. (Hear, hear.)

COUNCILLOR WORMALD.

With reference to Councillor Wormald's remarks, that gentleman had set out by saying he could contradict nine-tenths of his (Bailie Lewis') speech. He would ask them whether Councillor Wormald had succeeded in doing so. They would remember that Councillor Wormald was one of those who, knowing that the Water Trustees

had resolved to go on with the St Mary's Loch scheme during the present session of Parliament, had voted for the appointment of these Trustees to prosecute the Bill.

Councillor WORMALD—My statement was that I voted for them under protest, and on the distinct condition that they should publish and circulate every report, and after that had been done, to call ward meetings and take an expression of public opinion.

Bailie LEWIS said he had heard this explanation for the first time last Tuesday; but what was the meaning of Councillor Wormald saying he voted under protest? Surely this was strange legal logic, especially when it was remembered that there were another batch of Trustees put up by the opponents of the bill, whom Councillor Wormald could have voted for. (Hear, hear.) Could they conceive a greater absurdity than that, if two alternatives were placed before him, of voting in favour of and against this bill, that he should vote in favour of the promoters and against the opposition list, and then turn round and say he did so under protest? The whole thing was so ridiculously absurd that it admitted of no argument. (Laughter.) Certainly he would not like to be Councillor Wormald's client, if he placed his case in such a position before a civil tribunal. (Hear, hear.) Then it was alleged that the Trustees had kept back information, but all the Water Trustees were aware of what took place in connection with this matter, and Bailie Cousin was a party to the keeping back of Mr Leslie's and Mr Stewart's reports. From the nature of these reports, he would ask them if the Trustees would have been doing their duty if they had done otherwise than keep them private, in so far as the question of compensation was concerned; for it must not be lost sight of that everything concerning the cost, estimates, and quantity of water for town supply, in both the reports, were printed and circulated through the official reports, and also through the press of the city. The Trust were being confronted by an opposition—not a citizen opposition. (Hear, hear.) He was free to confess that had it been a citizen opposition he would have been the last man to have withheld even the information about the compensation, which would have been unnecessary; but they had opposition from a foreign power, from the millowners of Selkirk, and their interest was diametrically antagonistic to that of the citizens. If, therefore, there were statements in these reports which, if the millowners knew, would give them an undue advantage over the citizens, he would ask them if the Trust ought to have made these reports public at the time? He believed they would have been considered as acting foolishly if they had published them. (Hear, hear.)

COUNCILLOR WORMALD'S DEFENCE OF MR COWAN.

He now came to a promise which he had made to Mr Wormald on Tuesday, in reference to Mr Cowan's correspondence with Mr Ramsay in regard to the log which had been placed on the weir at Glencorse, and anent Mr Cowan having been the cause of the removal of that log from the reservoir, which, by the Act of Parliament now on the table, had been handed over to the people of

Edinburgh. He then said he would read the correspondence when he came to reply, and if he did not now make out his case, he was prepared to retract the statement made, while speaking to his motion, if he did not convict every unprejudiced mind. (Applause and hisses.) The first letter he would read was one to Mr Ramsay from Mr Cowan, and was dated 12th June, 1860, from Valleyfield. It was as follows:—"Since we met in the Logan-Glen on the 5th ult., I have consulted the friend to whom I then referred, and who, I consider, is well qualified by his position and otherwise to say what the Company ought to give for the privilege of raising the level of the large reservoir to the top of the log, which I allowed them temporarily a few years ago. By the advice of the gentleman to whom I refer, I express my willingness to grant this privilege in perpetuity for a yearly payment of ten guineas, payable at Whitsunday yearly—the first payment commencing, with the acceptance of this offer, on or before the 13th curt. (to-morrow) for 1860. I intend to leave Edinburgh for a somewhat prolonged absence on the Continent upon Thursday morning. I shall expect the Company, if they accept, to pay all charges of conveyance, &c." He then read Mr Ramsay's reply, dated 12th June, 1860, as follows:—"I am favoured with yours of this date. It would have been a great relief to me had you allowed till Thursday to accept or reject your offer. On that day there will be a meeting of directors, who would have considered the matter, and instructed me according to their own views. The shortness of the time you allow—only one day—places me in a position I am by no means desirous to occupy, and forces me to assume a power and a responsibility proper to my constituents only. The price you ask for the land, which will be flooded by raising the water to the top of the log on the waste weir, considering that it will be covered with water for but a short period of the year, and chiefly during the winter months, is certainly very high; but as it may occasionally be of value, and as the directors have on several occasions expressed a desire to treat for it, I think it better at once to accept of the offer as it stands in your letter, in the hope that, at the meeting to be held on Thursday, it may meet with their approval. Please, therefore, to consider the matter settled." He said he would next read an extract from the Water Company's minutes ratifying the transaction, and declaring it finally and permanently settled.

Mr HOPE—Now, Mr Wormald. (Laughter.)

Mr WORMALD—Oh! I am all right.

Mr HOPE—You are all wrong. (Cries of "Irregular.")

Bailie LEWIS continued to say, that after this extract from the record they found a letter, dated 5th December, 1860, from Mr Cowan to Mr Ramsay, which was as follows:—"When I made offer to you last June of the privilege of raising the water of the reservoir to the level of the log permanently, you will find by my letter that the first payment of ten guineas a-year was to be made upon your acceptance of my offer. You accepted my offer forthwith, but the payment must have escaped you. Will you be so good as send me a cheque for it.

I wish very much that you would take some steps to improve the road up the glen, which is, by the side of the reservoirs, in a sad state of disrepair. The water stands always upon it, having no means of getting away, and, as you must have remarked, it is in a very bad state." He held that if it was possible to prove a case, he had proved this to a demonstration. (Cries of "No, no," and "Yes.") He would next read an extract from this correspondence, dated 19th July, 1869, from Mr Cowan to Mr Ramsay, immediately after the passing of the Water Districts Bill, which conveyed the property from the Water Company to the hands of the citizens, and before it received the Royal assent. It was as follows:—"For the last eight or nine years the Water Company have paid me, through you, the sum of ten guineas for the privilege of continuing to raise the level of the Compensation Pond one foot above your statutory rights; and the sum of £10, 10s. should have been paid at or since Whitsunday last for the current year, as the bargain was that it should be payable in advance. I am now desirous to discontinue the privilege, and have to request that you will immediately cause the log to be removed, or that you will ensure it being removed at or not later than Whitsunday next." If language meant anything, it was evident that the privilege granted by Mr Cowan was a permanent one, yet as soon as the Water Bill passed the Lords in July, 1869, before it had even received the Royal assent, he had demanded that it be taken off. Councillor Wormald had said he would leave this matter in the hands of Mr Cowan to clear up, and he (Baillie Lewis) would also leave it there.

COUNCILLOR WORMALD AND THE ALLEGED WASTE.

Not to pursue this point further, he would now refer to what had been said regarding the question of waste. There had been something said about keeping back information, but there had been one thing kept back which had never yet been mentioned. Some of them would recollect that Mr Ramsay had on one occasion, before the Water Company handed over their works, come into the room and said he was prepared to recommend something in the way of checking the waste. As Baillie Cousin would recollect, Mr Ramsay took from his pocket a leather bag containing a number of "strictures," some of them small and some large, and said he would like if they would authorise him to put these in the pipes, but it would need to be done in secret, so as not even to allow any of the Trustees to know of it. They had not felt justified in acceding to this proposal, and he for one would be no consenting party to these "strictures" being placed in the pipes without the full knowledge and consent of the whole Water Trust, and, what was more, the general community. (Applause.) Then, again, Councillor Wormald said the Water Trustees had done nothing to check waste. He did not think it was necessary to take up time to prove that this was incorrect, except to say that the very first thing the Trustees did was to instruct Mr Gale to report on this question of waste. Mr Gale told them it was an exceedingly difficult thing to do anything to check waste with an intermittent supply, and nothing that could be done

during the ensuing summer would be of much avail. However, they at once engaged no fewer than four practical men to visit the houses and endeavour to check any waste that might exist. These men visited upwards of 30,000 houses, examined every cistern in them, and all the apparatus. After this he would ask if it was fair to say the Water Trust had done nothing to check waste. Then Councillor Wormald told them that if this bill was passed, no water would be brought into the city for seven years. No doubt there was a clause in the Act saying they had seven years to execute the works, but that did not go to prove for a moment they were to be seven years without water. On the contrary, they had the evidence of contractors shewing that the water could be brought in in four years at the utmost. As to the quantity, Councillor Wormald had told them the old story of Norwich and other places, where they did with a limited quantity of twenty or thirty gallons per head; but in making these references they forgot that Edinburgh was in different circumstances from these English towns. He was no engineer himself, but every man he had spoken to who knew anything about water supply was prepared to say that Edinburgh, situated as it was upon these high ridges, and with its high-storeyed houses, was one of the most difficult places to supply with water in the kingdom, and was in quite a different position in this respect from Norwich and other English cities, which stood on level ground, and were principally composed of low-built houses and cottages. To talk, therefore, of fifteen or twenty gallons as anything like a fair supply was no argument whatever to them. With their close foul closes, they required an extra supply, and as Providence had given them such a supply of water, was it not folly to measure it out in gallons, as if it were porter or ale? (Hear, and laughter.) With these immense tunnels as sewers in Edinburgh, carrying off the night soil of a population of upwards of 200,000, it was a monstrous delusion to talk of all water as wasted that was not used for drinking, cooking, and similar purposes. (Applause.)

COUNCILLOR WORMALD AND PETITIONS.

Then there came again the matter of the 40,000 signatures. The question which was put to him on that subject never crossed his mind until it was put to him in the shape in which it was put; but he knew something as to the number of inhabitants, and something, in a rough way, in regard to the ratepayers, and he stated his opinion that, if the advocates of the Bill had taken the same amount of time as the opponents, they might have got 40,000, instead of the number which the opposition had obtained. Was he not justified in making that statement? ("Yes," and "No.") What evidence was there in November last to show that the scheme was not cordially approved of? None whatever. (Hear.) He would say that he was not surprised at the agitation which had since sprung up, in view of the statements which had been made as to the quality of the water, the cost of the enterprise, and the supposed enormous taxation which would follow.

(Hear, hear.) He would have been surprised had it been otherwise. (Laughter.) But at the meeting of St Leonard's Ward last year the scheme was explained; it was put to the electors whether the enterprise should be prosecuted, and there was not a dissent—there was not an objection—there was nothing but an expression of satisfaction. Councillor Wormald says that they must deduct 14,000, who would sign the adverse petition. Surely he does not expect them to be foolish enough to believe that these names could have been got had a petition in support of the bill been in the field. He also speaks of 3000 names which have never been seen. Besides, it is notoriously known that the signatures against the bill had been mostly obtained through misrepresentation. But Mr Wormald said that Bailie Lewis forgot to make a reduction of 20 per cent. for those who were sick and out of town. When did this new doctrine dawn upon Mr Wormald's mind? There was a time when he thought differently, when he got a document signed by the last elector and beyond it in the contest in Broughton Ward, and when there was neither sick nor absent to be found.

Mr WORMALD.—I most emphatically deny it.

Bailie LEWIS.—You may. I might go over to the Crown-Office across the street, and there obtain evidence of the most pointed and costly character. (Hear, hear.) I might press this question further, but meantime shall not do so. ("Go on.")

OPINION OF ST LEONARD'S WARD.

The cry had also been raised that Bailie Lewis had represented St Leonard's Ward to be unanimous. That was true—quite true. He did not need to say he was speaking of the state of matters when he left Edinburgh. This question had been before the ward meetings again and again. On the 25th of October last, Councillor Mackay had told them that the Water Trustees had that day resolved unanimously—(Convener Field dissenting)—to prosecute St Mary's Loch scheme in the present session of Parliament. This statement was received with applause. Bailie Marshall also stated himself to be a supporter of the scheme, and his sentiments were heartily responded to. Bailie Lewis went into an exposition of the whole question, submitting the reports furnished from engineers, medical men, chemists, and accountants, upon the quality of the water and cost of the undertaking. He went into the details of the estimates, and called special attention to the discrepancy between those of Messrs Stewart and Bateman and Mr Leslie. Everything that he knew he communicated to them, with the exception of that referring to compensation with the Selkirk millowners, whom he knew were organising opposition against the citizen interest. Having done all this, he then told them it was for them to decide whether or not the scheme should be prosecuted with their consent and approval. Not only was there no objection stated, but the opinions of the three representatives were accepted as the opinions of the meeting. From that hour up to the time he left Edinburgh to

appear before the Commons' Committee, he had never received any communication, neither had he been waited upon by any of his constituents expressing their disapproval of the scheme. This was a question which had cost him too much time and labour to be now readily abandoned. In 1865 he was pledged by his ward to use his influence to secure for them an adequate supply of water, and thereby to relieve them from the terrible sufferings which they were called upon to endure. He had visited their houses by the score. He had gone up into their garrets, and examined their cisterns, empty for days and weeks together. He had listened to the recital of their tales of domestic suffering and inconvenience, and seen the wives of working men arrested in their washing operations for want of water; and the present bill was the result of his earnest labours to rid his constituents from a clamant and terrible grievance. Again and again he reported to them at the ward meetings the progress which was being made; and he asked, Was it for a moment to be expected that he would now be either intimidated or concussed by the instigators of this temporary tumult from the prosecution of this beneficent undertaking? (Hear, hear.) Was he now to be asked, after he had been requested to secure a better supply of water—after he had visited houses by the score, and seen the sufferings of the poor—after the Council had entered into a solemn covenant with the corporations of Leith and Portobello—was he now to break that compact? After they had spent thousands of pounds, would they ask him to retrace his steps? He said, No; they had committed him to the scheme, and he would go through with it if possible. There would be no hedging nor trumping up of excuses with him. (Applause.) He would ask the Council to treat him as they would like to be treated in such circumstances. There was no reason why he should change his mind on this matter; and the more he looked into it the more confirmed he became. An impartial Committee of the House of Commons had decided in favour of the bill; and he was entitled to say, also, that the House of Commons was unanimous in favour of the bill; for, on the report of the Committee being submitted, there was not a single dissentient voice. With a unanimous ward, and without a dissentient voice in Parliament when it was introduced, it would require something very different from what he had heard to make him change his mind. (Applause.)

COUNCILLOR MUIRHEAD'S ADVICE.

Bailie LEWIS, resuming, said Mr Muirhead had given him advice. Mr Muirhead would like if Bailie Lewis would attend more to his own business. He thanked that gentleman for the advice—(laughter)—but so long as he did not owe him anything he did not think himself bound to take it. (Laughter.) How would Mr Muirhead feel if Bailie Lewis should tell him he would like him to be a little more attentive to his business? Mr Muirhead would say, and justly, that it was a piece of impertinence—(hear, hear)—so long as he supported his wife and children, and did not trouble others for anything. He

might not spend his leisure hours as Mr Muirhead would wish, neither might Mr Muirhead please him in the way his leisure hours were spent; still that was a matter which concerned themselves as individuals. At the same time, he was of opinion that if he had been in the habit of spending his time in a more questionable way than he did, the solicitude of his attendance to business would not have been thus publicly manifested. What was the reason of Mr Muirhead's advice? He would like Bailie Lewis to take less interest in public affairs. This he was honest enough to confess. Ah! there were more than Mr Muirhead who would like that. He had been before the citizens for some time; and until such time as it could be shewn that he had done more mischief than he had yet done in connection with public affairs, he would continue to act precisely as he thought proper. (Applause.) There was something more than water in the present opposition. He did not think he was speaking beyond what he was warranted in saying when he asserted that, upon the part of some, there was a greater disposition to ruin the reputation of Bailie Lewis than to damage the Water Bill. (Prolonged applause.) There was much of that the result of personal pique; and he was free to believe that if the measure had been promoted by some one else—if it had been promoted by Trustees, more of whom had come from the higher classes of society—and if there had been fewer of the lower classes supporting it, there would have been less opposition than there was. (A voice—"Quite true.")

PERSONAL VINDICATION.

Bailie LEWIS proceeded to say that he had for the last twelve months wished for an opportunity to reply to the slanderous accusation which had been circulated against him in regard to the question of the managership—(hear, hear)—and that time, he was thankful, had now arrived. He said that members of that Council came to his house and to his shop—and, let it be marked, that some of the gentlemen he spoke of were at that time, and were still, opponents of the bill—and said to him, "If you consent to resign your seat in the Council, we will do what we can to secure you the position of manager of the Water Trust." What was his reply? He put his foot upon the proposal. He said emphatically, "No." (Applause.) If there was a man there who could say that, by word or deed, he ever indicated a desire to accept the position, let him at once stand up and say it. (Loud applause; and Mr Gordon—"You are a noble fellow.") They were all present, with the exception of Councillor Younger, to whom he had never spoken on the subject, and he now gave them the opportunity to stand up and justify the calumny, and failing to do so, he had a right to demand, in the name of outraged justice, that they should henceforth be silent. (Applause.) He stated distinctly that he would not entertain the idea. And why? He did not need to do so; he was independent of it. (Hear, hear.) More than that, he told his friends that if he accepted the position he would feel his mouth

shut upon public questions, and for that he was scarcely prepared. Another reason was this, that he had been in some measure associated with questions of social and political reform in the city and country, and that he believed those questions would suffer if he appeared to seek his personal interest at the sacrifice of principle. (Applause.) With clean hands he appeared before Edinburgh and before all Scotland; and let no man again slander his reputation in regard to this matter. He resented the imputation, and maintained that the Trustees were doing what they were compelled to do. During the last twenty-five years two-thirds of his leisure hours had been directed to the study and advocacy of social and political progress, and he dared any one to say that he had ever pocketed a single shilling in his life. (Hear, hear.) He believed there was something more in the opposition than had yet been stated. Who could read the fiery, fierce appeals which had been made to excited mobs to rise and turn out the promoters of the bill, and not see that there was something of an attempt to secure a political revolution in the city? There were those who, in consequence of the extension of the suffrage, had been driven from political power in Edinburgh, and they were taking hold of the water measure as a lever by which to try and again get into power. But the attempt would fail. He did not care what the result of this vote would be. (Hear, hear.) It was a question in which he had no personal interest; but he knew that this conspiracy would fail; and why? There was a principle deep down and unchangeable in all government, that they never found men organised for an improper purpose permanently succeed. They might cohere for a time, but as soon as the temporary object was accomplished, if they were bound together by self-interest instead of patriotism, they must fail. (Hear, hear.) In regard to those who had changed their votes, he said he honoured men such as Bailie Miller, who had opposed the appointment of the present Trustees, and had opposed the bill from first to last; but he asked those who were wavering whether they would listen to reason or to the voice of popular tumult for the hour. Let them cast aside prejudices, and vote according to their convictions. Talk of perilling their seat! What, he asked, was the value of a seat in this or any Council when compared with sacrificing solemn convictions, and trampling principles in the dust? He might be wrong, but he believed the Water Bill was safe. It would require a stronger opposition than had hitherto yet appeared to cast out a bill backed up by a united Committee of the House of Commons. It was not so much a question of the bill now, but a question whether or not they were to relieve the pockets of Mr Cowan and his coadjutors, and pay the expenses of the lawyers opposing it. (Cheers and hisses.) He knew that was an idea not to be relished, but the division would decide whether the corporation funds were to be taken to pay the expenses of the opposition.

Councillor WORMALD—Quite right.

Bailie LEWIS—Councillor Wormald says quite right. He was glad that this was admitted.

Mr MOSSMAN—It is a bitter pill that.

Bailie COUSIN—It is to prevent the public funds being wasted, by putting an end to the bill.

Bailie LEWIS said that the Water Trustees were almost unanimously satisfied that it was their duty to proceed with the bill. They were told that the public funds had been wasted.

The CONVENER—In the most extravagant manner.

Bailie LEWIS asked, "Who was to blame for that?" Finally, the Trustees would not be concussed by clamour or overawed by intimidation. They were resolved to appeal to the House of Lords, and they had a firm conviction the House of Lords would confirm the decision of the House of Commons. (Applause.)