

soil, moreover, did not determine the saccharine matter. That was affected by moist or dry weather, proper or in-different care, etc. In regard to the

second part of the motion, he desired to say that seeds were being distributed and tests were being made under the direction of officials of the department at all localities where Boards of Trade, Agricultural Societies, or other responsible bodies undertook to provide facilities for a fair test.

The motion was withdrawn.

Election of County Councils.

The motion for the second reading of Mr. Tucker's bill to amend the municipal act led to considerable discussion. The bill proposes that County Councils consist, as under the old system, of the Reeves of townships and villages and Mayors of towns not separated from the county, instead of being elected by popular vote, as is the case now. The bill further provides that members of Councils shall have votes in proportion to the number of people they represent.

Hon. Mr. Davis said the measure would repeal the County Council act.

Mr. Kidd (Carleton) said the act should be repealed. The old system had worked well; the present act was a failure, and had led to the introduction of politics in municipal affairs and other evils.

Mr. Russell (East Hastings) was of opinion that the present act worked very well. There was no desire for a change in his part of the country.

Dr. Barr said the only people who did not desire the change were the County Councillors themselves. Every one else was in favor of a change.

Mr. Dempsey (Prince Edward) was in favor of the change. The best men, he said, were being driven out of municipal life under the present act.

Hon. Mr. Dryden said that, speaking for himself, he was in favor of reducing rather than increasing the number of Councillors. He considered that the clause regarding the voting powers of Councils was one that should be condemned. It would simply place the power in the hands of the few members of Council who represented the largest number of electors, and that might lead to great evils.

Mr. Monteith (South Perth) briefly expressed approval of the bill.

Not Ripe For Change.

The Attorney-General thought that the House should not act spasmodically. The proposed change was a constitutional change, and that being the case nothing should be done before the matter had come before the country for discussion. The present act had been in force some time, and it would be an easy matter to make full inquiry into its workings, and amendments could then be made if found desirable. It could not be denied that the act had produced one good result, namely, the reduction of unwieldy bodies, meeting for several days and spending much time over minor business, to smaller and more businesslike methods of working.

Mr. Tucker read several newspaper extracts reporting County Council meetings at which changes to the act had been suggested.

Mr. Hislop (East Huron) did not think that the present system had any effect on the quality of men elected to the Councils; they were just as able as those who were successful under the old act. As to the introduction of politics into County Councils, that was no new question. Politics had always played a part in such elections in his county, and this was no doubt the case in other constituencies.

Repeal at Any Price.

Mr. Whitney expressed surprise at what he termed the half-hearted defence by two members of the Cabinet of the Council Council act. The Minister of Agriculture had said that the influence of the County Councils had deteriorated, and the Attorney-General had said that Township Councils were deteriorating. For his own part he (Mr. Whitney) was not in favor of the clause in the bill as to votes of members of the Council, but he was willing to vote for that if the measure could be passed and the County Council act repealed. The inquiry as suggested by the Attorney-General would, he believed, result in the repeal of the act.

The Attorney-General said he had not spoken of Township Councils deteriorating under the act. He had said that some contended that such was the case, though opinions differed on the matter.

Mr. Whitney considered that this statement furnished sufficient proof that the people were not all in love with the act, as the Government had once claimed.

Should be Considered.

The Premier reminded the House that the question at issue was whether the bill should be sent to the Municipal Committee. To do that was to accept the principle of the bill. The County Council act was largely introduced as an experiment. There was under the old act a large over-representation in County Councils for the duties they had to perform. He did not think the educational advantages of the County Councils suffered by the change. If there were changes needed the House could readily amend and modify the act, as they did other laws, but it was due to the dignity and steadiness of the House that they should not proceed hastily.

Mr. Wardell (North Wentworth) and Mr. Duff (West Simcoe) favored the repeal of the act, and Mr. Malcolm (Centre Bruce) commended the present act for its reduction in the number of County Councillors, adding that there were too many members in the Legislature.

The Division.

The second reading was then lost on the following division:—

Yeas—Allen, Barr, Beatty (Leeds), Brower, Carnegie, Carscallen, Colquhoun, Crawford, Dempsey, Duff, Eilber, Fox, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Little, Marter, Matheson, Monteith, Morrison, Macdiarmid, McLaughlin, Powell, Pyne, Reid (Durham), Tucker, Wardell, Whitney—28.

Nays—Auld, Aylesworth, Barber, Beatty (Parry Sound), Blezard, Breithaupt, Bridgland, Brown, Burt, Caldwell, Carpenter, Charlton, Conmee, Davis, Dickenson, Douglas, Farwell, Gibson, Graham, Gross, Guilford, Har-