

members of the Legislature, and ought to be able to become candidates. It did not always follow that representation was the result of taxation, for at present those who had not sufficient property to come up to the qualification required for the franchise had not the right to vote though they were taxed. It was said that because women now had the privilege of voting for school trustees, therefore they should be allowed to vote in municipal elections; but this very fact that scarcely a single woman now availed herself of the privilege of voting for school trustees was the strongest argument against the Bill. He hoped the House would vote very decidedly against the measure.

Mr. LAUDER said that he would have voted for the Bill had it only applied to unmarried women and widows.

Mr. MILLER and Mr. ROSEVEAR said that they were in the same position as the member for East Grey.

Mr. SINCLAIR said that he was in favour of the principle underlying the Bill, but thought the franchise should not be forced upon any class if they did not demand it. He moved in amendment that the Bill be read this day three months.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) contended, in reply to the observations of the Commissioner of Public Works, that it was better to begin with the municipal franchise, as the lesser matter, than with the Parliamentary franchise. The fact that this Bill would be likely to prove the thin end of the wedge with regard to certain possible innovations was no answer to a question of right and duty. The member for Addington had remarked that in his opinion the right stamp of a representative woman was she who attended to her domestic duties; but woman was man's equal and should be so treated. He promised if the second reading was carried he would in Committee so amend it as to apply only to widows and unmarried women on the principle that half a loaf was better than no bread.

Mr. CURRIE said he favoured the principle of the Bill, and would vote for its second reading. The fact that the women had not asked for the measure was no reason why it should not pass.

Mr. WILSON said he would vote against the Bill, even if amended as the mover had proposed. This course was dictated to him, not so much by a desire to benefit the male portion of the community as from the belief that by so doing he would be acting in the best interests of those for whom the franchise was now sought. (Hear, hear.) All those who had anything to do with election contests knew that there was very much in connection with them in which they would not desire to see their wives and sisters participate. It was sheer nonsense to speak of women in Canada being a down-trodden sex, for they were as highly honoured as they themselves could desire. The women themselves did not seek to be enfranchised.

Mr. BARR said if the Bill had been similar to the one introduced last session he would have supported it.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) said that while he had supported the Bill of last session he had to oppose this one, as it was based on an entirely different principle. It was so framed, moreover, that by the rules of the House he and others in the same position would have to vote against the second reading. He was at the same time strongly in favour of conferring the franchise upon widows and unmarried women, so far as municipal elections were concerned.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) said that to relieve hon. gentlemen from their rather awkward position he would withdraw the Bill.

Mr. ROBINSON said he thought that ladies as a rule had enough to do in the way of governing their own houses. He was in favour, however, of conferring the municipal franchise upon unmarried women.

Mr. CREIGHTON made some further observations, in which he contended that the ladies would not degrade themselves by voting at municipal elections. The Commissioner of Public Works had the other night contended that the Government ought to have votes on their property in Toronto if that property were taxed.

Mr. FRASER said he had not suggested that they should have votes for municipal Councillors or members of the Legislature, but only that they should have a vote on by-laws in reference to the issue of debentures.

The House then divided, and the amendment was carried—Yeas, 57; Nays, 12.

YEAS—Messrs. Barr, Barter, Bell, Bishop, Bonfield, Boulter, Broder, Brown, Cameron, Chisholm, Code, Cole, Coutts, Creighton, Crooks, Deacon, DeRoche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fisher, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grant, Hardy, Hargrave, Hodgins, Hunter, Kean, Long, Lyon, McCraney, McDougall (Middlesex), Macdougall (Simcoe), McGowan, McRae, Masie, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Mostyn, Mowat, O'Donoghue, O'Sullivan, Pardee, Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Tooley, Watterworth, Wilson, Wood—57.

NAYS—Messrs. Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Currie, Haney, Harvie, Lauder, McMahon, Miller, Paxton, Robinson, Striker, Widdifield—12.

The main motion as amended was carried on the same division.

AMENDMENT OF THE MUNICIPAL ACT.

Mr. SPRINGER moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Act respecting the Municipal Institutions of Ontario. The object was to extend the bridges which villages would have to construct from 100 to 300 feet in width over a stream.

After some discussion,

Mr. DEACON said that if this Bill went to Committee every member would have some little amendment to suggest. It was better that some municipalities should suffer a little than that they should be continually tinkering the law.

Mr. SPRINGER said the grievance of which he complained was a serious one in many counties, and it certainly demanded some remedy.

Mr. BISHOP, after referring to the difficulties which occasionally arose under the present Act, said that some amendment of the law was imperatively demanded.

Mr. BAXTER hoped the general principle of the present law which made the counties responsible for all bridges over a certain length would not be interfered with.

Mr. FERRIS said that nearly every county would want a special amendment of the law if it were once interfered with.

Mr. CAMERON hoped the law would not be changed.

Mr. GIBSON said that if the Bill was left to a special committee the proper limit might be determined, especially as they were about to have the law consolidated.

After remarks by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Hunter,

Mr. MOWAT agreed that it was not desirable to be constantly amending the municipal law, but as there had been a number of small amendments since the last consolidation, it might be well on the eve of another, to make such changes as might be pretty generally desired without interfering with the principle of the present law.

After further discussion the motion was carried, the Bill was read the second time and referred to a select Committee.

Mr. MOWAT moved for an adjournment of the House.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS FOR 1876.

Mr. CAMERON asked when the Public Accounts of 1876 would be before the House.

Mr. CROOKS said the manuscript had been in the printer's hands on Monday. He knew that the printers were very hardy pressed with work at present.

EXTENSION OF THE FRANCHISE.

Mr. CAMERON said he thought that a measure of such importance as this would have been thought worthy of a place in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech—as was the case with the proposed Bill in regard to the franchise for farmers' sons—should not be delayed until a late period of the session. Perhaps the Government intended to drop the Bill.

Mr. MOWAT said the Government had no such intention. The delay had been occasioned by some questions of detail, which though, not of very great importance, should be finally settled before the introduction of the measure. The Bill might possibly be introduced to-morrow, though it was not likely to be brought down until Monday.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Miller—On Friday next—Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 42), respecting the Credit Valley Railway Company—will move to add after the words "additional aid," in line 22 of section 2, the following:—"In which case it shall be at the discretion of the Council of the Municipality to submit a by-law to the vote of the qualified electors, and except as herein provided."

Mr. Preston—On Monday next—Bill entitled an Act to amend the Act respecting line fences