

## TUESDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

Tuesday, March 24.

The House passed a quiet but useful day in the discussion of various Government measures. The entire afternoon was spent in committee upon Hon. Mr. Hardy's important bill to reduce the number of County Councillors, an exceedingly full discussion taking place upon the Government's proposition. A large number of other Government bills were dealt with in the evening.

On the orders of the day being called the following bills were read a third time and passed:—

Respecting the Village of Tilbury Centre—Mr. Pardo.

To further improve the agriculture and arts act—Mr. Dryden.

Respecting the Township of Mornington—Mr. Magwood.

Respecting the London Street Railway Company—Mr. German.

To amend the act incorporating the Ontario, Belmont & Northern Railway Company—Mr. Blezard.

### COUNTY COUNCILLORS.

The House then went into committee on Hon. Mr. Hardy's bill to reduce the number of County Councillors. In introducing the consideration of the bill, Hon. Mr. Hardy announced a number of changes which he had decided upon, partly in consequence of the discussion upon the second reading. In the first place, the bill would be made to apply to all counties, and in consequence the schedules would have to be altered by the addition of a new class of counties, those of 25,000 population and under. Then, experimenting with some sections, he had found that the divisions could not always be made so as to be uniform, and consequently he had inserted a clause giving a certain amount of latitude in the making of these divisions. Thus, in a county of 25,000 population and under there would be not less than 4 nor more than 5 divisions; in counties of from 25,000 to 40,000, either 5 or 6; in counties of from 40,000 to 60,000, either 6 or 7, and in counties of over 60,000, either 7 or 8. Further provision was made for the nomination of an officer for each division for the conduct of the election, and it was also provided that the nominations should be made by means of a paper signed by 20 electors. In the case of united counties, each would be treated as a separate county to arrive at a basis of population.

The bill was discussed at some length. Dr. Meacham and Col. Matheson opposed the bill, saying there was no public demand for it; Col. Matheson defended the County Councils quite stoutly. Mr. Cleland criticized some features of the bill, but was in favor of it. The bill should, he said, be put in force without reference to the County Councils or to the people. The people were sick and tired of the excessive numbers of the County Councillors, and wanted a change. Dr. Willoughby said that he had not heard the bill approved by anyone. The course he would like to see taken was to require a greater number of votes for Deputy Reeves.

### FOR THE BILL.

The Speaker discussed the bill, remarking that a number of persons and bodies had in times past expressed a preference for the plan of dividing the counties, and stating that the Essex County Council had expressed itself in favor of the bill; it had expressed a desire to retain the representation of municipalities, but had said that if this could not be managed they wanted the bill given a trial. The suggestion to wait another year was a very old one, the Speaker pointed out, and he concluded by strongly urging that the passing of the bill would put an end to the pulling and hauling of local interests; the county would be administered by men acting for the county