

extent of some cities and towns in Canada. Several remedies had been proposed, one of which was embodied in the Bill. He had had the valuable assistance of Mr. Phipps, of this city in fixing the basis upon which the Bill was framed. Mr. Phipps had made a careful examination of the city assessment, and the result showed that municipal affairs were very largely controlled by household voters. In St. Andrew's Ward the tenants were 1,224; the freehold votes 842, and the income votes 58. By the provisions of the Bill, the proportion would be changed to about 2,000 voters as owners, and 1,224 household votes. In all the wards of the city the large majority of the voters were the small tax-payers. Our whole system of municipal representation was lame, defective, and illogical; for next year's votes were cast on this year's property. He referred to the mass meeting of workmen recently held with regard to this Bill, and said that it was the best reason in the world for a change. It was a common thing for appeals for support to be made on the cry that one workman should help another, and the result was that many of the best men in the community—those who had the largest interests in the Municipality—were shut out altogether. Under the present system it was made an object with those who held household votes to create deficits from year to year as had been done in Toronto, the result being either that the obligations were repudiated, or the city had to borrow and thus throw the burden in the long run upon the holders of property. He then made mention of the almost universal dissatisfaction with municipal works, and attributed the defects to the civic authorities, in the presence of the contractor, losing all control, the latter influencing the numerous votes of those whom he employed. He had been taunted that his advocacy of this measure was a going back, it being to all intents and purposes a Tory measure, but he contended that it had now become a necessity, considering the large sums being municipally expended, that the voter's power should be commensurate with his means, and that the accepted notion of representation going alongside of taxation be adopted. He alluded to the case of the town of Stratford in support of his views when he said that of 1,300 ratepayers paying \$35,000 the class paying under the limit of \$25,000 swayed the power of the others, which showed that the power was not distributed in proportion to the bulk of taxation. The evil of this was not so great in the country, but it was notorious in cities. He said this was no new idea that he sought to introduce, it having been adopted in Australia. He could not be called an aristocrat, having come from the people; he desired only, on introducing this matter, to prevent one class from domineering over the other. He thought that all measures having reference to the repression of vice might be much better carried into effect by taking the discharge of them from the municipal authorities and concentrating them in the Government.

Feb. 20

Mr. MOWAT said he fully admitted the importance of the subject and the desirability of having it discussed in the House. There were doubtless evils in our municipal system, but he failed to see that the Bill would provide a remedy. His own experience was that class was not found arrayed against class. It was an exceptional case in which the poor were not divided and the rich equally divided. He did not think there was a single member of the City Council who did not owe his seat as much to those who would have a plurality of votes under the system suggested as to those who would have single votes. He considered that it was a much easier thing for the rich man to pay his large amount of taxes than it was for the poor man to pay his small amount, and the poor had, therefore, a stronger motive for municipal economy than the rich. Then the greater part of municipal legislation referred chiefly to matters affecting the poor. This was so even in the matter of drainage, a question which so vitally concerned the health of the poor and their children. A large portion of the municipal expenditure not only affected property, but the person. For instance, the police and gas service were necessary for the protection of the person. It was as important for the poor that the police force should be efficient as for the rich. Did experiences show that the poor favoured municipal extravagance? He thought the reverse was the case. Then all matters of legislation affecting morals must be of equal importance to all classes of the community. He was not prepared to say that better Government would prevail if greater power were given to the

rich. The only method he saw of securing improvement in municipal representation was by increasing the intelligence of the people; in other words, by increasing the efficiency of the schools. It was not found, either, that men of wealth and intelligence were rejected by the people when they asked for their suffrages. The reference to joint stock companies had no point, because they dealt with property alone. Equal voting had not prevented men from accumulating wealth. On the contrary, all the wealth that had been accumulated had been obtained under the present system. He thought, therefore, that the Bill could not claim the support of the House.

Mr. CAMERON said that he disagreed entirely with what the member for Stormont had said. Even though the man assessed for a small sum exercised the same control as his richer neighbour, he was not prepared to give the wealthier more power unless it could be shown that he was more intelligent, upright, and honest. He contended that the improvements in the large cities was the result of action by the wealthier rate-payers and not by the smaller ones, who always are in favour of economy in municipal matters. Though he was against manhood suffrage for the return of members to the House or to municipal corporations, he could not support such a measure as the present one, until it had been shown that an injustice had been done.

On the House calling for a withdrawal,

Mr. BETHUNE said that as the measure had been introduced so late in the session, and there was so little time to discuss a measure of its importance, he would withdraw it for the present and introduce it again next session.

RAILWAY LEGISLATION

Mr. CAMERON called the attention of the Attorney-General to the resolution in aid of railways, which he gave notice on the 14th Feb., and which he had not yet brought under the consideration of the House. He also asked when they were to be asked to ratify the Orders in Council regarding the Prince Edward Island Railway, City of Ottawa Junction Railway, and the Credit Valley Railway. He complained of the delay, and said that time would not be approved to discuss them.

Mr. MOWAT said that it was his intention to introduce to-morrow his Railway Aid Resolution, and that ample time would be given for the discussion of those other matters.

On the motion of Mr. Mowat the House adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 21,

The Speaker took the chair at 3 p.m.

PETITIONS.

The following petitions were presented:—

Mr. Cameron—Of J. H. Venables and others, of Toronto, praying that the Mayor may be elected by the people.

Mr. Bell—Of M. McCabe and others, of Toronto, to the same effect.

Mr. Currie—Of the Agricultural Society of Lincoln, praying that Township Agricultural Societies may be abolished.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES.

Mr. CLARKE (Wellington) presented the report of the Printing Committee.

THE DUNKIN ACT.

Mr. MOWAT moved the first reading of a Bill to make certain amendments on the Temperance Act of 1864. He remarked that during the discussion on the amendments to the License Act, it had been suggested that it would be very desirable in counties passing the Dunkin Act Bill that the Bill should go into force on the first of May—the date on which the licenses granted under the License Act took effect—instead of the first of March, as at present. It had been stated that great inconvenience had resulted from the difference in the two dates. There was some doubt as to whether this Legislature had any jurisdiction over the Temperance Act of 1864; he had come to the conclusion that it would be better to assume that jurisdiction in the meantime at all events. It had also been impressed upon the Government that it would be desirable to apply the ballot to the Dunkin Act. The Bill would include a provision to that effect.

The motion was carried and the Bill read the first time.

TOWNSHIPS IN NIPISSING.

Mr. MOWAT introduced a Bill to apply the Municipal Law to certain townships in

Nipissing which was read the first time.

THE ELECTION LAW.

Mr. MOWAT said he had intended to introduce a Bill making a few changes in reference to certain evils discovered in the Election Law. One evil was in connection with the affidavits in regard to the Voters' Lists. Owing to the fact that a sufficient expression of opinion had not been obtained in reference to these changes, he had abandoned the responsibility of introducing a measure of this kind, but would probably do so next session. He, therefore, would merely introduce the Bill he had put forward at the beginning of the session, entitled "An Act to amend the Act respecting the election of members of the Legislature."

The Bill was read the first time.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS.

The amendments made in Committee on the Bill to incorporate the People's Gas Company were concurred in.

The amendments made in Committee on the Bill respecting the Toronto Street Railway Company were concurred in.

The Bill to provide for the erection of a court house in the city of Hamilton was read the second time, on motion of Mr. Sexton.

ELECTION OF MAYORS IN TORONTO.

On the motion for concurrence in the amendments made in Committee on the Bill respecting the city of Toronto, the Toronto Water-works and other matters,

Mr. CAMERON moved the recommissioning of the Bill to Committee of the Whole with instructions to strike out the clause providing for the election of the Mayor of Toronto by the Council of the Corporation. The change was not one which was desired by the people of Toronto, as was evidenced by the fact that largely signed petitions had to-day been presented in favour of retaining the present system. The Mayors of Toronto had generally been men well fitted for their position.

Mr. HODGINS said the gentleman involved was one of principle. The Mayor was merely a presiding officer, and like other presidents should be elected by the body whose deliberations he guided. With regard to his position on the Board of Police Commissioners, it was known that this body controlled expenditure for which the City Council had to provide, and this was a reason why he should be elected by the Council. He could obtain petitions signed by thousands in favour of the Bill as passed by the Committee.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE thought it peculiar that if the Council and citizens wished the change the call for it did not come through its representatives. He contended that it was not wanted, and he trusted that it would not be granted by a House which wishes to be thought progressive, and which has been lately extending the franchise. He thought it would be inconsistent to take back the franchise from those who were now in this matter exercising it properly. He thought this measure would permit of the election of a mayor who might be personally distasteful to the people.

Mr. BELL was decidedly opposed to the election of the Mayor by the Council. Two large petitions had been presented to-day praying that the election of the Mayor might continue to be vested in the people. The matter had long been discussed, and it had not been found that any citizen outside the Council was in favour of the change authorized by the Bill. He thought the agitation was caused by certain gentlemen who were unpopular with the people, and knew they had no chance of election under the present system. He understood a deputation had waited upon the Attorney-General in opposition to the change.

Mr. MOWAT said the hon. gentleman was mistaken in stating that such a deputation had waited upon him, and that the agitation was originated solely by unpopular candidates for the mayoralty. The present Mayor was in favour of the Bill.

Mr. BELL said it was only that morning that the Mayor had expressed his opposition to the Bill.

Mr. MOWAT said that in that case the Mayor must have changed his mind.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) favoured the election of mayors in cities by the Corporation, but thought the change should be effected by general legislation, and not smuggled through in a Bill relating to the Toronto Water-Works and other matters, and applying only to the city of Toronto. If the city of Toronto desired a special charter for its