

## For Good Government

The associations interested in civic reform in Montreal called together by the "Citizens' Association" have held several meetings and a programme drawn up by the delegates of the joint bodies submitted to the discussion of the individual associations. The recommendations of the sub-committees of the joint bodies included two members of the League, the Hon. Dr. Guerin (Chairman) and Dr. Adami, president of the C. I. L.

For the convenience of our members we submit the amended resolutions adopted:—

1. That the City of Montreal be divided into five electoral districts, each district to be represented by three aldermen.

2. That the three aldermen for each district be elected by the whole body of electors of that district.

3. That as regard the mode of subdivision of the City, this committee recommends the adoption of the plan prepared and submitted by the Citizens' Association (with the number of electors in the different wards modified according to the latest electoral lists at the City Hall), this being in its opinion most equitable to all interests concerned for the present.

That subdivision is the following, each ward being given, with the number of voters in it:—

### North District.

St. Denis.....	12,208
Ahuntsic.....	1,029
Bordeaux.....	992
Mount Royal.....	792
Cote des Neiges.....	208
Laurier.....	10,498
	<hr/> 25,717

### South District.

West.....	1,659
St Ann.....	5,183
St. Gabriel.....	4,464
Ste. Cunegonde.....	2,553
St. Henry.....	6,975
St. Paul.....	910
Emard.....	1,773
	<hr/> 23,517

### West District.

St. Lawrence.....	5,481
St. George.....	2,452
St. Andrew.....	3,634
St. Joseph.....	4,441
Notre Dame de Grace.....	2,994
	<hr/> 20,002

### East District.

Delorimier.....	3,705
St. Mary.....	5,565
Hochelaga.....	5,889
Rosemount.....	432
Longue Pointe.....	1,841
Papineau.....	8,730
	<hr/> 26,162

### Centre District.

St. Louis.....	6,477
East.....	786
St. James.....	3,375
Lafontaine.....	5,794
St. Jean Baptiste.....	5,405
Duvernay.....	3,512
Centre.....	1,242
	<hr/> 26,592

4. That, as at present, the term of office of Mayor and Aldermen be two years.

5. That the number of Controllers be increased to five.

6. That the term of the Controllers be four years, with the exception of those elected in 1914 when the two Controllers who have received the lowest number shall be elected for two years only, but shall, however, be eligible for reelection. At the election of 1918 the other three Controllers shall retire. These also will be eligible for re-election.

7. That taking into consideration the responsibility of the work undertaken by the Controllers and the time devoted to the service of the City, the salary of the Controllers be ten thousand dollars per annum: and the aldermen fifteen hundred dollars.

8. That the salary of the Mayor be twelve thousand dollars per annum.

9. That the Mayor be ex-officio a member of Board of Control. In the event of a tie the Mayor shall have the casting vote.

10. That the Controllers elect their Chairman to serve under such conditions, and for such period as they deem most suitable for the transaction of their work.

11. Three members at least of the Board of Controllers shall constitute a quorum and the affirmative vote of at least three members shall be necessary to adopt any resolution or ordinance. The secretary shall keep a complete record of all transactions of the Controllers.

## MUNICIPAL REFORM

Municipal reform has suffered from the lack of team play among its friends. Reformers, as a recent writer has well said, are primarily protestants, and it is the nature of protestants to be insubordinate. It is temperamental inability to tolerate the existing situation that makes a man a reformer, and it is the same trait that makes him, as a rule, intolerant of all ideas except his own. Reformers can always agree upon basic principles, for these are commonly framed in such platitudinous form that even the most arrant political pirate would not refuse open assent to them. But, as occasion arises for elaborating these principles into working rules of administration, it forthwith becomes apparent that each reformer has his own interpretation of them and that all who disagree with him are lacking either in intelligence or integrity or in both. Across the history of nearly every municipal reform movement of the last twenty years may be found written the tedious chronicle of bickerings, due to personal jealousy, class bigotry and the failure of reformers to realize that vindictiveness has no place in the program of a political agitation which seeks to be successful.

From the experiences of the past, reform organizations can draw abundant counsel for future action. To secure achievements of permanent value they must seek far more than mere change in the personnel of city government. They must simplify the political framework when necessary and make it afford those opportunities for constructive effort which are the only enduring attractions of public service. They must adjust the administrative machinery of the city to the work which it is called upon to do a mission which in any large city is a reform task of Herculean proportions and of corresponding value when performed. If laborers in the cause of civic improvement desire to see in concrete form the results of their exertions they must also adjust their methods to the conditions of political warfare in a democracy, which means specifically that they must recognize the utter weakness of a house divided against itself, the impotence of purist professions that do not square with the facts, and the unerring certainty with which extravagant pledges return to work upon those who promise, in the way of public improvement, more than they can fulfill.—Wm. Bennett Munro, of Harvard University, in Citizens' Bulletin.