

hon. gentleman contended that the Bill included step-sons. It did not apply to step-sons. The step-father was included in cases where the mother had married again and the stepfather had a right to vote. It was easy to understand what confusion would be created if stepsons were included, and it would be sufficient to point to a case where the stepfather had sons of his own. It was urged that the son was not made liable for the taxes, but section 4 did have this effect.

Mr. SCOTT stated that he had said that practically the son paid no taxes.

Mr. FRASER said that the hon. member for South Grey asked the reason for the insertion of section 5. The reason was that some of the assessments would be made this year before the Act came into force, while others would not, and this section made the Act come into force at once in all the municipalities. There was therefore no reason for referring the Bill to a Committee for revision. Hon. gentlemen opposite had contended that there had been no agitation in the country about the measure, no discussion among the people, no demands for it, and that it had been sprung upon the House, and that the Government would not allow time for the country to become acquainted with its features. The hon. member for Essex stated that this matter was not touched upon at all at the meetings in the country when members of the House addressed the electors. This he denied, and for his own part he took occasion to say at all the meetings attended that the time was coming when the franchise would be given the farmer's son, and this assurance was received with approval. The people had pronounced upon this question at the recent election in Frontenac. One of the candidates stated that he was in favour of the Bill, and pledged himself to vote for it, while the proposers and seconders of the candidates also pronounced in favour of the Bill. If the hon. member for Frontenac were in his place that evening, he would have been obliged to vote against the amendment if he kept faith with his constituents. The people in the country had also spoken in Wellington upon this question. When his hon. friend for South Wellington was before the people seeking election, one of the features of his platform was that he favoured the franchise of farmers' sons. Two constituencies had therefore pronounced in favour of the measure since it was mooted. It was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and ever since the press had discussed it, and many of the organs of the Conservative party had been pleased to advocate it, or the only objection they made was that it did not go far enough. In 1874, in the leading organ of the Opposition, in an article headed "Revision of the Voter's Lists," dated Nov. 3rd, the conferring of the franchise upon farmers' sons was advocated. The fact was that the Opposition were not willing to trust to the farmers to vote them into office. The Government contended that the Bill was the logical sequence of the income franchise, which, passed two sessions ago, gave votes to a class to be found principally in cities and towns. The earnings of the farmer's son went into the farm, and he remained the partner of his father with the view that ultimately he will get his earnings back again. If paid in the shape of wages, he would probably earn more than those enfranchised by the Income Act. The experience of what occurred in rural constituencies—that bogus leases and other expedients were resorted to to get the franchise—justified the necessity of the Bill. There was a good deal of very hard swearing, and it was desirable to put an end to this state of affairs by giving the right to which the farmers' sons were entitled. The House and country being so strongly in favour of the measure, he need say no more in its advocacy. The hon. member for East Toronto was desirous of killing the Bill, and had adroitly moved his amendment in order to allow members to vote for it, and yet excuse themselves by saying that they did not oppose the measure, but merely advocated its extension. He begged to remind hon. gentlemen that as the amendment would kill the Bill, they could not vote for the amendment if they were in favour of giving the franchise to the sons of the farmers.

The House then divided upon the amendment of the member for East Toronto, which

was lost by the following vote:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Brown, Cameron, Cede, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Fleisher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, Macdougall (Simcoe), McGowan, McRae, Merrick, Monk, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Richardson, Scott, Wills—27.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Dawson, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham Grant, Hardy, Hargraff, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McDougall (Middlesex), McMahon, Massie, Miller, Mostyn, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (York), Paxton, Robinson, Rosevear, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snelinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Wigie, Williams, Wilson, Wood—51.

The House then divided upon the third reading of the Bill, which was carried upon the following vote:—

NAYS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Cameron, Cede, Coutts, Creighton, Currie, Deacon, Fleisher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, Macdougall (Simcoe), McGowan, McRae, Merrick, Monk, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Richardson, Scott, Wills—17.

YEAS.—Messrs. Appleby, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Brown, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Dawson, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham Grant, Hardy, Hargraff, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McDougall (Middlesex), McMahon, Massie, Miller, Mostyn, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (York), Paxton, Robinson, Rosevear, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snelinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Wigie, Williams, Wilson, Wood—51.

Mr. CAMERON asked the Attorney-General when they might expect the legislation upon railway matters.

Mr. MOWAT said he expected to present the Railway Bill on Monday next.

On the motion of Mr. MOWAT, the Speaker left the chair at 12:50 a.m.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

The Hon. Attorney-General Mowat—On Monday next—When the House goes into Committee, a resolution that out of the surplus interest now accumulated upon the moneys in, or invested by the Court of Chancery, the sum of \$1,104 45 be transferred to the credit of the Treasurer of the Province, to be applied in making good certain defaults of the late W. M. Wilson, Esquire, Judge of the Court of the county of Norfolk, and Real Representative under the Partition Act, in and for the said county. Provided that the said sum shall be subject to any claims to the same, or any partition thereof, which hereafter may be made and established by any of the suitors of said Court, or any of their representatives.