

said, "there was only one case in which a Division Court officer ever had a chance to make anything of me." He went on to show also that not the small section in which the officer carried on his work but the whole people were interested in the duties of these officers in administering justice or keeping property secure, and therefore it would be a violation of the principle that those who pay the officers should appoint them to have them elected by the votes of people in their several localities. He closed with an expression of confident opinion that the Legislature would not adopt the Yankee system advocated by Mr. McColl.

Mr. Meredith found fault with the expression "Yankee," interpreting it as a term of contempt for the people across the line, and remonstrated with the Attorney-General for using it, particularly in view of the negotiations now pending with that country. He hoped that the fact that the Premier of Ontario had used such an expression would not go abroad. Mr. Meredith made these remarks with a serious face. He declared also that the Attorney-General regarded this matter as he did all others, from a party point of view. He met the question as to the difference between Dominion and Provincial officials by saying that the people of the United States where the elective principle was recognised evidently saw some difference in these classes of officers because the customs officials, etc., were appointed by the Executive. He wholly agreed with Mr. McColl in saying that the patronage now in the hands of the Government was a dangerous thing, and advocated the plan of having some of these officers at any rate appointed by the County Councils. This would bring the power nearer to the people, and if a further step in the direction of the radical change proposed by the mover of the resolution was desirable it could be made. Meantime he thought the House and the country, and particularly that part represented by Mr. McColl, where this question was receiving great attention, owed the hon. gentleman cordial thanks for having brought the matter forward. But even should the vote of the House be favorable, public sentiment was not ready for the legislation to which the House would thus be committed, and he suggested therefore that on the conclusion of this debate the motion should be withdrawn.

Mr. O'Connor was the next speaker. The representative of South Bruce does not often take part in the debates, but no man outside of the Cabinet is able to command closer attention or greater respect when he



doesspeak. He declared himself in favor of the principle of the resolution and, opposing the Attorney-General's strongest argument, contended that by means of popular election at least as good a class of men would be put in public office as

those now employed. In support of this he instanced the House itself, whose membership, chosen by popular election, he thought quite equal in every respect to the body of public officials of any class. As to the patronage, he thought many of the members of the House would agree that it was a burden instead of an advantage, and while he would not shirk any duty his position imposed upon him he thought it an advantage in many ways to have the responsibility shifted from the representatives of the people to the people themselves. He opposed wholly Mr. Meredith's idea of handing the power over to the County Councils, contending that it would not, as alleged, bring the power near the people. He agreed that public sentiment on this subject was not sufficiently advanced to call for the embodiment of the principle of the motion in the statute books, but such discussions as this would help greatly to educate public opinion, and at some time in the not far distant future he expected to see such a resolution as they had before them receive the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. Balfour has already placed himself on record on this question in favor of the election of some officials by the people. In a concise and able argument he stated again his position. He spoke of the resolution last session as more general in its terms and not committing those who voted for it to the principle of electing the minor officers. That resolution he had supported, and as he believed in the principle, though he would include some of the officers mentioned, he would support this motion. He saw no reason for leaving the power to the County Councils, holding that the Legislature represented the people as much as the Councils did.

Mr. Fraser rose and began a vigorous speech by the plain statement that he thought it not going too far to say that the system proposed was a most pernicious one. He disabled the argument that the plan was in use in the United States by saying that it was the feature of their system which the clearest thinkers and best citizens most regretted. The American reviews and every means of the expression of the best class of public opinion made it clear that, that opinion would get rid of this system were that possible. The history of the system was the condemnation of it. Where, he demanded, would the election of officers stop. If the people elected the county attorney why not the county judge, why not some of the other judicial officers, as, for instance, the police magistrates and the ordinary justices of the peace? He dwelt upon the tendency under the elective system to suspect the officers of party feeling, and upon the temptation to officers thus elected in performing their duties to have regard in everything they did to political effect. The appointed sheriffs and registrars regarded themselves as removed from a political career and bound to administer their offices fairly to all. From these officers were chosen the returning officers, upon whose judicial fairness depended the proper conduct of elections. The disadvantage of having those officers political partisans he held to be obvious. He ridiculed particularly the idea of having minor officers, some of whose positions yielded less than \$100 a year, elected. Should the time come to which Mr. O'Connor looked forward when the House favored this proposition, he (Mr. Fraser) would feel that one of the worst steps ever taken with regard to the country's political future had been taken.

Other Speeches Against the Motion.

Mr. T. Gibson (Huron) asked why the supporters of the motion did not go for the whole system of the Americans. He opposed the proposal, and hoped the present system of appointing officials would not be changed.

Mr. Wood (Hastings) thought that when the member for Elgin got older and thought more about the matter he would change his mind. He thought with the Commissioner of Public Works, that it would be a sorry day when the American system of appointing officials was introduced into Canada.

Dr. Barr made a speech favoring the resolution.

Mr. Waters was opposed to the principle of the bill, but not because he had not faith that the people would make as good appointments as at present are made. But there was a considerable agitation being carried on by the Patrons of Industry for a change—an agitation which was being carried on because the farmers think the officials would be more under the control of the people, and because they supposed their salaries excessive. The hon. member was glad to hear the Attorney-General say the other day that the Government might be expected to deal with the reduction of excessive salaries. If that were done it would

