

with the favor of the people. The system proposed by the bill would be in every way the best in the interests of all.

Mr. Racine, in the shortest of the speeches, opposed the measure. The system now existing had, he said, worked well, both as to the celerity with which business was despatched, and because it was less expensive than the old system to which the Government's act was a return.

Mr. Reed also protested against the measure. He concurred in the views of the former speaker as to the acceptability of the present system, and its saving as compared to its predecessor. He quoted some comparative statistics in support of this contention. Speaking from his experience in the county Council, he was able to say that the act now in force gave fairer representation than was proposed under the new measure. There was no general demand for a change.

Mr. Munro contended that the present system had continued growing in favor from its inception. The new measure was a retrograde step, and if carried would soon result in as great a clamor for change as had been the case prior to the coming into force of the present act.

Mr. Little represented an electoral district which had not formerly objected to 56 members as too large a number in the county Council. They thought there was safety in numbers. The present system was much more costly than the old one. The late Mr. Hardy had argued that the act of 1896 would do away with party politics in the Councils, but it only introduced party feeling. The system had been tried, and had not worked according to expectation.

Mr. Atkinson testified that his home Council was composed of old Reeves and Deputy Reeves. They did business more rapidly than under the old system. He did not see the use of going back upon the old system unless they could better it, and, as far as he could judge, it would be a mistake.

Mr. Pearce was heartily in accord with the measure.

Mr. Neely thought the word economy should not be mentioned in connection with the act. When it was considered there were always some committees in session in connection with the Councils, the members drawing per diem and mileage fees, it would be found that the cost was as great as under the old system.

Mr. Auld had been opposed as strongly as anyone to the act of 1896, but believed the present bill was a step backward. The county Councils were too large, and he would advocate having three commissioners to take care of the affairs of the county.

Premier Whitney—That's Liberalism! "I believe the affairs of the county would be better looked after than they are to-day," continued Mr. Auld. Whatever was the case in Simcoe county, in Essex the present system only cost half as much as the old, and the committees cost less than half. He supposed the bill would become law, but not if anything the Opposition could do would stop it.

The debate was continued by Messrs. Kerr, McMillan, Morrison, Kidd and Kohler.

The Opposition Leader.

Hon. Mr. Ross rose in the hope that Premier Whitney might yet reconsider his determination to push the bill through. He must feel from what had been said that the bill was not as good as he thought, and would not serve the purpose it was intended to serve. He might find it would have been more satisfactory politically to him, if the speaker might advise, had he never introduced it. In face of the expressions from men of influence and of experience he could very well afford—and it was all Mr. Ross would ask—to let the bill stand over for a year or two and see if public opinion registered the same expression. There did not

seem to be any deterioration in quality of the work done by municipal Councils in the smallest villages or in the largest counties. Why, then, should they hasten in this course? They had heard occasionally from Premier Whitney that he leaned rather towards stability than change. If there were any good in Conservatism it was that it moved slowly. The member for Carleton had reprimanded the speaker in connection with the options in the county Council system. It was true Liberalism. The municipal good roads were largely a result, he thought, of the progressive spirit thus fostered. Nothing was then to be gained from the bill. As to the quality of the men, the Earl of Derby was Mayor of Liverpool and Earl Rosebery had been Chairman of the London County Council. The speaker would not restrict but expand the usefulness of the county bodies. On the ground of economy, of education, of wider outlook, of experience, it might be asked, Why the change? The act had a hundred options. They were in the game laws, the school laws, the liquor license laws. In all the larger questions the principle of option was involved. The old system gave uniformity, and in this respect the present bill was not fair at all. In his own constituency he had the smallest municipality, paying a county rate of \$112, while London paid \$11,341. This was a great disparity, and such a disproportion as the new bill would establish was not fair. He was sure there would be more complaints. With regard to the educational value, they might get 815 members, but the training in the township Councils was as good as that of the county Councils. The business of the counties was as well done as ever. It was good legislation to let well enough alone. They were getting more and more county jails and better ones. The wider area covered gave a larger outlook and developed a larger spirit. The disqualifications were perhaps a blemish in the present system, and he was prepared to remove it, nor would he chide Premier Whitney if he stayed his hand. It would be doing a wise and useful thing, and would serve the Province far better than by pressing the bill on the attention of the House at the present time.

The Premier Closes the Debate.

The Premier held that the men who devised the municipal system of Ontario were inspired. Their scheme of having Reeves and Deputy Reeves stepping up to the higher positions in the county Councils was an admirable plan, the educational benefits of which could hardly be overestimated. He had never seen any evidence anywhere of any organized body objecting to the old system. Some members of the present county Councils had objected, but he believed that no Government of this Province had ever faced a public question on which the people were so united as on this. He did not see why there should be any delay. The bill was first introduced a year ago, it was discussed in the newspapers, there had been every opportunity for county Councils to discuss it and enter protests, if they so desired, but they had not done so. Another reason against delay was the fact that the hon. gentleman himself had never been satisfied with the present measure, but had always been tinkering with it, and members on the Government side in the former Administration had expressed their dissatisfaction with it more than once. Referring to some criticisms and suggestions respecting representation, the Premier said that equalization in this regard was impossible. "The city of Toronto," he said, "has nearly 300,000 people, and on the basis of representation by population it is entitled to ten members in this House instead of four. I hope to live to see the day when Toronto will have approximately ten members. I apprehend that if that does not occur my hon. friend from North Norfolk will rise in this Legislature and object."

The Government, he continued, had made its position perfectly clear before the people. It had gone to the people for their endorsement, and the people had approved of its attitude. The system of connection between the township and the county Councils now to be reintro-

duced, with the educational value he had mentioned, would be ample justification for adopting the measure. He closed by reading extracts from *The Toronto Star*, which he described as the "junior organ of the Opposition," approving of the Government's proposals.

The Division.

The amendment was lost on the following division:—

Yeas—Atkinson, Auld, Harcourt, Hislop, Kennedy, Kohler, Labrosse, May, Munro, McCoig, MacKay, McMillan, Pense, Preston (Brant), Racine, Reed, Ross, Thompson (Wentworth)—18.

Nays—Aubin, Bowyer, Bradburn, Brower, Calder, Carnegie, Carscallen (Hamilton), Carscallen (Lennox), Clark (Bruce), Cochrane, Craig, Dargavel, Devitt, Downey, Duff, Ferguson, Fisher, Fox, Foy, Gallagher, McGarry, McNaught, Neely, Pattinson, Paul, Pearce, Pratt, Preston (Durham), Preston (Lanark), Pyne, Reaume, Smellie, Smyth, Sutherland, Torrance, Tucker, Whitney, Willoughby—56.

The following were paired:—Mr. Graham and Mr. Crawford, Mr. Clarke (Northumberland) and Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Smith (Sault) and Hon. Mr. Beck, Mr. Cameron and Mr. Eilber, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Jessop, Mr. Smith (Peel) and Mr. Nixon, Mr. Rathbun and Mr. Lackner, Mr. McDougall and Mr. Thompson (Centre Simcoe), Mr. Bowman and Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Tudhope and Mr. Mahaffy, Mr. Currie and Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Clapp was absent, unpaired.

The bill was read a second time.

Debate on Budget Resumed.

Mr. Thompson (South Wentworth), in resuming the debate on the budget, criticized the Treasurer's powers as an estimator, quoting some of the discrepancies between his estimated and actual revenue and expenditures. He also criticized the flotation of the Provincial bonds, arguing that the transaction had been mismanaged, and that the Province was giving for 96 cents what it should have received one dollar for. Mr. Thompson contended that the Provincial Treasurer's statement did not give any true idea of the financial condition of the Province. Alluding to Hon. Mr. Matheson's hope that the Province would soon be relieved of its guarantee of the \$2,000,000 Soo loan, he recalled the opposition of the Government to the former Administration's action in this matter, and pointed to the prosperity of the Soo industries as justification of what had then been done. It was a fine commentary upon the lack of foresight of the present Government. He concluded with another reference to the bond issue, in which he declared the Treasurer had not done credit to Ontario.

Notices of Motion.

The following notices of motion were given:—

Mr. Craig has bill to amend the high schools act.

Mr. May will inquire: Who was inspector of licenses for Windsor and North Essex in 1904 and 1905? When was he appointed? What is the amount paid as salary for said inspector? When

was the inspectorate of Windsor and North Essex separated? If so, when and why? What is the name of the inspector of licenses for Windsor? When was he so appointed? What is his salary? What is the name of the license inspector of the North Riding of Essex? When was he appointed and what is his salary?

Moved by Mr. Pyne, seconded by Mr. Matheson, that bills No. 95 and 167 re-amending the high schools act be referred to a Select Committee of this House, consisting of the following:—The mover, Hon. Mr. Monteith, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Neely, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Smith (Peel), Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Clark (Bruce), Mr. Preston (Brant), Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Hislop, Mr. May.