

# EAST KILDONAN RESIDENTS TELL OF DISSENSION

## Rural and Urban Areas Opposed in Evidence on Bill

About 300 citizens met the committee on municipal affairs in its rooms today to present views on the question of dividing the municipality of East Kildonan. Speakers were interrupted frequently.

E. J. McMurray represented these petitioners who desired to divide the municipality. He contended that his 150 clients were engaged in farming or market gardening. He declared there was a conflict of interests and that rural ratepayers were dominated by urban ratepayers in matters of municipal administration. The urban section needed water, sewers, sidewalks, fire protection, but these were not sought by the rural section.

He spoke of excessive school taxation, contended that his clients were taxed out of all proportion to benefits received, and that no relief could be got from the council. Taxes, he said, in the outlying portion amounted to confiscation practically. He, personally, owned 40 acres of land close to St. Paul's. The tax was \$500, and the rental about the same. If the municipality were divided, the rural section would have greatly reduced taxes and the money would be spent on requirements suitable to the character of the locality.

M. J. Stanbridge asked whether the speaker bought for speculation. Mr. Murray replied he did, but that he had farmed it for ten years.

H. C. Whellams spoke as a market gardener. He was not a speculator or real estate man. He said there were 5,100 acres with just a few houses, which had no improvements more than they had ten years ago. The district had suffered from the inflation of prices by speculators.

No man, he said, could act as reeve in the present municipality without pandering to the urban population. At this point there was an uproar, and he was required to modify his statement.