

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 votes. 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 adduced 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 swamped 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.

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 experience 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.