

TO THE EDITOR

THE MARKET.

To the Editor of The Expositor:

Sir.—In his letter of yesterday Ald. Ham charges me with "making false statements," "talking rot," "coercing the people," "throwing them down," "taking away their rights," "talking nonsense," "afraid of a puff of wind," "afraid to meet him like a man," and so on. There is no argument in stuff of that kind, and Ald. Ham is too much of a gentleman to use it unless perchance in a moment of haste. If he will allow me I will forget that I have seen it, and will assure him once for all that I will not allow the discussion of any public question to mar our friendship or destroy the respect we have for each other as men. Ald. Ham admits that he cannot make the proposed new site larger than the present one without "including Water St. This street runs parallel with Colborne street from Market street to the Grand Trunk station, at which point it joins Echo street, and intersects Colborne. Surely we have enough dead property already on our hands, and in any event I strongly object to any part of such an important street being permanently used for market purposes. No person representing the council or any of its committees has ever approved the Wallace plan of buildings, and when Ald. Ham, sets them and knocks them down he proves nothing. Ald. Ham says the best half of the market square is not worth \$150,000, and that he is getting ready to trade it for the old postoffice. To this I object most emphatically. There is great value in the market square and we have too many old buildings on our hands now. By the way, what use is to be made of the other half of the square? Will it become a second edition of the Waterous property to adorn the city, or is there another old building for which it also can be bartered?

To use a pencil and a piece of rough paper to convey in a brief conversation one's idea of a building for any purpose might very easily leave a wrong impression, and yet that is as far as the committee have gone with plans this year. I cannot therefore be charged with approving or disapproving of an plan because none has been submitted by myself or anyone else. The committee in its own report agreed to produce plans adapted to the present square, and it should do so. Citizens who want buildings on the present square should not be asked to produce the plans any more than those who want the buildings elsewhere. But to sum up, Ald. Ham is now pledged as follows:

1. To secure a new and suitable site for the market at a reasonable cost.
2. To exchange one-half of the market square for the old post-office.
3. To do something else with the other half of the square.
4. To secure from the government an agreement to erect on the square a great public building.
5. To secure from the Legislature such powers as may be necessary to remove the market or the city hall and complete the scheme without loss to the city.
6. Get the whole question, with all its details, into concrete form and have the two schemes, embracing plans on the two sites submitted to the people in such a way that they can settle it at the polls next January. There are some very good and some very bad features about the scheme. Ald. Ham deserves credit for his industry and if he will start at the right end of the undertaking, doing justice to all those who favor each of the sites, and push the question to a finish this year, he will deserve the thanks of everybody. I am more than willing to work with him if he will agree to do that, but he must not come along next December and say that he has failed. We must have market buildings somewhere and that without delay. I propose at this point to drop out of the discussion and to await developments. Let no man think me so much welded to my own plans that I am blind to the merits of all others. There is room for honest differences of opinion, we must be respectful, tolerant and fair-minded in our attitude to each other, and we must stay on the ground and build in the best possible way a market and a city for to-day and to-morrow and the years to come.

W. B. WOOD.

TO THE EDITOR

ALD. HAM REPLIES TO THE MAYOR.

To the Editor of The Expositor:

Sir,—I feel that in justice to myself and committee I should reply to Mayor Wood's letter in last night's issue. The mayor seems to labor under several difficulties: 1. Want of proper knowledge of the committee's proposals, and the real facts in connection with the whole question; 2. his apparent short memory; 3. his misfortune in making pledges without a knowledge of the whole question; 4. his tendency common to most people to draw on his imagination when facts are not available, as shown in his statement that I said the "best half of the square was not worth \$150,000. I have never said that. The committee is proposing to sell the Dalhousie street half of the square, which, figuring it at the highest Dalhousie street values, would not come to more than \$75,000. If the mayor had been at any meeting at which I presented the scheme he would have heard it summed up this way; sell one-half the market square, valued by some at \$150,000 (possibly we might not be able to get more than 100,000) taking as part payment the old postoffice property, valued at about \$50,000, but so as to be sure of not over-stating my case we will assume that we can only get the old post-office for it. We would require \$5,000 to fit it up as a temporary city hall, and to make a park out of the balance of the square to be used as such until opportunity offered to sell the old postoffice for a good price, then to build a new city hall on that part of the square. I am glad that the mayor has put himself on record as opposed to taking over the postoffice in trade for new site, as I assume that the government officials are business men and will naturally want to use the present postoffice in any deal for another site. Where the mayor's memory fails him that it is not so very long ago that he thought it would make a good city hall. In regard to his reference to pencil and piece of old paper, would say there are two sets of floor plans on draftsman's paper, drawn to scale, which have been in the mayor's office at the city hall for the past month or so, and which I will be glad to explain to the mayor any time. The mayor is mistaken in regard to our report, the exact reading of which is as follows:

Clause 3. That persons in favor of the present site or a permanent market square, and the erection of market buildings thereon, be requested to appoint a committee to place before your committee their wishes in reference to the buildings to be put upon the present square, and the construction thereof, so that the same may be embodied in your committee's final report.

The mayor asked the question whether these people were expected to furnish plans at their own expense. I replied "Certainly not," that the committee would furnish them with part of their appropriation and suggested that they would rather a special committee be appointed to work with them, which suggestion was not acted upon, when the committee said they would do the best they could to lend assistance, but strongly objected to fathering the plans as we have gone into it, and concluded that we could not devise anything we could recommend. I object to some of the things that he wishes to commit the committee to, but when the proper time comes will discuss them, and if our scheme is not in such shape that it will command the approval of the intelligent electors, it will not be presented. In that case the mayor will have his desire and only have the one proposition to vote on.

JOSEPH HAM.

TO THE EDITOR

STOP THE ABUSE OR DO AWAY WITH THE MARKET ALTO- GETHER.

To the Editor of The Expositor:

Sir,—Can I encroach a little on your space to bring to the notice of our City Council, guardians of our interests; the abuse which is constantly going on in making the market the dumping ground of bankrupt stock and job lots of wholesalers' cheap junk, to the detriment of the business of the surrounding merchants, who are paying high rents and taxes at the rate of 21 mills on the dollar for the upkeep and upbuilding of our city. Almost every Saturday sees a quantity of this stuff run off by two or three hucksters, generally of the Jewish persuasion. Only last Saturday, in particular, a wagon load of job boots was brought on the market and auctioned off under the auspices of a couple of these gentlemen, who are under no other expense but a few dollars' license, (even if they pay that, which they don't if they can avoid it), while there are four or five shoe merchants, on all sides and several others just on the corner of Colborne street, who, as I said before, are the props and supports of our city.

Such a condition is making us the laughing stock of other cities, (Rural Brantford.) Fancy anybody being allowed to bring a lot of old clothes or shoes on the market of Toronto; how soon they would be choked off and sent about their business. If the market is to be used for such purposes the sooner it is wiped off the face of the city the better for all merchants. Thanking you for the opportunity of expressing the sentiments of all of the sufferers by

ONE OF THEM

QUAKER OATS GRIDDLE CAKES