

caused jealousies, and the bill provided that the voters shall not give more than one vote for each such candidate, and also that where there is no suitable place within a County Council division at which to hold the nomination meeting, it may be held in some place within a city, town or village adjacent to the division.

Mr. Little endorsed the bill as a move in the right direction.

Mr. Matheson thought this was the beginning of the end, and hoped that next session the County Councils act would be knocked out altogether.

Hon. Mr. Hardy regarded the hon. member who had just spoken as being at the same time the most pessimistic and most sanguine member of the House. He had no doubt that the particular clause of the County Councils act at which this bill aimed has a great many opponents, which was, perhaps, natural. Where a place is largely Reform they were perhaps opposed to seeing a Conservative elected, as he could be by a combination of votes. Where it is largely Conservative they are even more averse to seeing a Reformer elected, and the result is that there is some dissatisfaction on both sides. If the smaller municipalities are prepared to endorse the bill now before the House there is nothing more to be said, but he believed that the act had worked well. Nevertheless, he is not so wedded to the clause as it is at present as to oppose its reconsideration either in committee or in the House. Perhaps it would be better for the bill to go to the committee, where it could be discussed.

Mr. Gibson (Huron) did not care about altering an act that has been so very short a time in effect and which is a protection to the smaller municipalities.

Mr. Stratton gave instances where the cumulative vote had resulted in giving small municipalities representation in the County Councils.

Mr. Auld showed that the operation of the act had effected a saving of 50 per cent. in many counties, and quoted as illustrations the following counties:—Essex, \$709; Lambton, \$900, and Middlesex, \$1,200 per annum.

Mr. Haycock admitted that the cumulative vote might be a subject for discussion, but stoutly advocated the principle of the County Councils act as good and beneficial as a whole. His experience had been that the people were generally satisfied with it.

Messrs. Pattullo, Magwood, Moore Blezard, Kidd, Willoughby and others kept up the discussion until 6 o'clock.

The following bills were read a second time:—

For better defining the relations between water supply companies and municipal corporations—Mr. Garrow.

To amend the municipal act—Mr. Marter.

Respecting the attachment of moneys in the hands of the Crown—Mr. McDonald.

Mr. Kidd withdrew his two bills to amend the municipal act.

#### Private Legislation.

The following private bills were put through the committee stage:—

Respecting the City of Ottawa—Mr. O'Keefe.

To incorporate the Canadian Consolidated Copper & Nickel Company—Mr. Biggar.

Respecting the consolidated debt of the Town of Cobourg, and for other purposes—Mr. Field.

Respecting the Hamilton & Dundas Street Railway Company—Mr. Flatt.

To consolidate the floating debt of the Town of North Bay—Mr. Loughrin.

These bills were read a second time: To incorporate the Ottawa Stock Exchange—Mr. O'Keefe.

Respecting the Town of Walkerton—Mr. Truax.

Respecting the City of Toronto—Mr. Crawford.

Respecting the corporation of the Town of Midland—Mr. Biggar.

To amend the acts relating to Victoria University—Mr. Davis.

Respecting waterworks in the City of Windsor—Mr. McKee.

Respecting certain by-laws concerning drainage in the Townships of Grey, Elma and McKillop—Mr. Gibson (Huron).

The House then returned to the consideration of the bill of Mr. Smith respecting County Council elections. It was read a second time and referred to the Municipal Committee.

#### Shooting Deer in the Water.

Mr. Kidd moved the second reading of a bill to permit the killing of deer in the water. He argued that as long as the law made it possible for hunters to find sport they would respect and uphold it, but when the law made sport impossible it would not be observed. He quoted the report of the game commissioners in support of the bill.

Mr. Gibson said that the main object of the law was to protect deer by making it more difficult to shoot them. The clause preventing the shooting of deer in the water had been inserted by way of compromise. But without going into the merits of the question the Minister urged the inexpediency of amending the game protection law this session. He undertook that he would ascertain the opinion of those who take out deer-hunting licenses next fall on this point.

Mr. Langford quoted the statement of the Chief Game Warden adverse to the shooting of deer in the water. He objected to the imposition of a \$2 license fee on settlers.

Mr. Haycock quoted from a letter written by Mr. J. L. Day of Kingston, on the authority of a man named Smith, resident in Hardy Township, in the Nipissing district, that in three townships 200 deer had been killed in one week. More deer were being killed in December than November. The settlers were killing the deer and selling them to the shanties.

Mr. Matheson strongly advocated the adoption of the amendment without delay.

Dr. Preston favored the elimination of the clause prohibiting the killing of deer in the water and urged immediate action on the bill.

Mr. Kidd reluctantly consented to withdraw the bill.

Dr. Willoughby said that it was unsportsmanlike to shoot deer in the water. If there was to be any change in the law he would suggest that the hunting of deers be prohibited.

The bill was withdrawn.

Mr. Kidd next moved the second reading of a bill to permit of the registra-