

MONEY VOTES ON JAN. 1 IN CITIES OVER 25,000

Mr. Beck Has Gooderham Bill Amended

HOT TALK IN COMMITTEE

Toronto's Purchase Deal a Factor in the Debate—Mayor Hocken, Mr. Crawford and Others Take Part.

When the Gooderham bill, providing for votes on money by-laws being taken on January 1 in cities of 100,000 and upwards, came before the Municipal Committee yesterday it was stated by Mr. Gooderham that the amendment of Hon. Adam Beck making it from 25,000 would meet his case exactly and he was perfectly satisfied with the amendment.

Hon. Adam Beck said he did not think it was imperative to have this applied to smaller municipalities. It was not an expensive matter in a village to take a vote or to bring out a vote, so he felt it should be limited to cities of 25,000, where the purchasing of railway or electric systems runs into millions of dollars, and where corporations could afford to spend an enormous sum of money to carry a bill if favorable to their own interests at a time when the people were not interested otherwise in coming out to vote as they were at the time of a general municipal election.

London Interested, Too.

Hon. Mr. Hanna—This bill is intended to meet the single case of the city of Toronto.

Mr. Beck—I take exception to that. I want this to apply to the city of London, irrespective of what Mr. Gooderham's intentions are to the city of Toronto.

Mr. Sulman (West Kent) thought it should be made to apply to all municipalities of the Province.

Mr. McNaught (North Toronto) said no matter when the street railway purchase question came before the people they would come out and vote, and he believed they would have as big a vote in the summer as on the 1st of January.

Hon. Thomas Crawford said the people were away in July, and they would not get a full vote.

Mr. Whitesides supported the Beck amendment.

Mr. Studholme was of the opinion that the voters would come out and cast their votes at other times than January 1. On the latter date many would be away to spend the New Year.

Mayor Hocken said there was a minority in the Council and a minority everywhere in favor of Mr. Gooderham, but he declared it was not dignified for the members of that committee to put themselves in the way of taking the part of a minority in a purely city controversy.

In reply to Mr. McPherson, the Mayor said that if the committee threw out this bill he believed the City Council would select the 1st of January. He did not think there was any likelihood of an unfair vote. Outside of July and August they would get as good a vote as at any other time of the year.

After some further talk Mr. McPherson (West Toronto) moved that these words be added to Mr. Beck's amendment: "provided that in the case of emergency the Ontario Railway Municipal Board may on application by the municipal Corporation direct a by-law may be voted on at any other

date than January 1."

This was put to the committee against the Beck amendment and was lost by 15 votes to 13.

The Beck Amendment.

The McPherson amendment dealing with emergency cases having been lost by a margin of two votes, Mr. Beck's amendment, reading as follows, was passed by a vote of 21 to 7:

"A proposed by-law may, and in cities having a population of not less than 25,000 shall, where it provides for the purchase or acquiring of any public utility or street railway, or for entering into any agreement for the purpose, or for disposing of any public utility, or granting any public franchise, be submitted only on the day fixed for taking the poll at the annual municipal election."

As soon as the amendment was declared carried Mr. McNaught proposed a rider that the clause should not come into operation until January 1, 1915.

Mr. Beck objected to this. "The amendment is carried; I claim there cannot be another amendment."

"It would kill the whole thing," said Mr. Gooderham.

"You might as well have no amendment to the bill as originally drawn," commented Mr. Crawford.

Feeling at this time began to run high and a number of members sought to speak at once. Mr. Hanna shouted for order. The yeas and nays were called for by several, but Mr. Hanna thought that was not necessary, as the opinion of the committee seemed to be strongly against Mr. McNaught's proposals.

Mr. Crawford charged the Provincial Secretary with endeavoring to defeat the object of the bill. Mr. Hanna quickly resented this, and said it was open to Mr. McNaught to bring in an amendment as well as to ask for the votes to be recorded. The vote was 8 for and 17 against the amendment. Mr. Gooderham throughout had the support of Mr. Crawford and Mr. Whitesides. Mr. McNaught and Mr. McPherson voted together.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION GETS FINAL READING

A large number of bills were given a third reading and put through the final stage in the Legislature yesterday. Most of these were private bills, but as many matters of importance are affected by the enactment of these laws it is likely that the Lieutenant-Governor will come to the House on Monday and give the Royal assent to as much of the legislation as has passed through the House so far. Already two bills have been passed into law this session, that relating to the plebiscite on the water situation in the city of Ottawa, and the act indemnifying Mr. G. Howard Ferguson (Grenville) from losing his seat through taking employment from the Dominion Government, as well as other members who were referred to but whose identity has thus far not been disclosed.