

changed within last sixteen years. An exemption of \$400 at that time was of much more benefit than it is to-day. In considering this matter it must be remembered that persons with small incomes bore a much larger share of the indirect taxation of the country than those with large incomes. Experience showed also that persons with small incomes were always taxed up to the very highest point, because their incomes were easily ascertained, while in the case of large incomes there were much better opportunities for concealing the amount. He was not in favour of personal taxation at all, regarding the principle as an unsound one.

Mr. MEREDITH opposed the Bill, as it favoured bank clerks and persons in similar positions of life unfairly.

Mr. O'CONNOR supported the Bill, while Mr. Drury said it would operate unfairly against farmers.

Hon. O. MOWAT thought the change proposed was greater than the Committee would approve or the House sanction. He was in favour of the Bill going to the Municipal Committee.

Mr. YOUNG was in favour of the Bill. At present skilled workmen, firemen, school teachers, and others of that class could not avoid the tax, while many better able to pay taxes could.

Mr. WATERS contended that it was the exemption of the rich against the poor.

Hon. C. F. FRASER while in favour of the Bill going to the Committee, was not prepared to say that the exemption should be \$1,000. It was only fair that the Bill should go to second reading.

Mr. BALFOUR called the attention of the House to the fact that the Dominion Franchise Act had been objected to because it fixed the wage-earners' franchise at \$300, which was said to be too high. If this were so, then the workingmen could not be injuriously affected by the income tax.

Mr. MERRICK objected to the Bill going to Committee.

Mr. HARCOURT was in favour of the Bill going to the Municipal Committee. He knew of no class of people in the country who were poorer or less able to pay taxes than residents of cities with an income of \$400 per year. The class of people who escaped taxation were those with large incomes.

Mr. WOOD was opposed to the Bill.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) said that it had been stated that the proposed change would make a difference of \$700,000 in the assessment of Toronto where the total assessment was fifty-four millions. All he could say was let the assessor take a little more care to assess the personal property and incomes of the wealthier classes. In cities it took between four and five hundred dollars a year to barely keep a family alive.

Mr. ERMATINGER, without committing himself to an approval of the Bill, thought it should go to the Municipal Committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that in many rural municipalities there were men living, keeping families, and educating them, on incomes of less than four hundred dollars a year. He thought that the city people with small incomes should move into the country.

Mr. AWREY opposed the Bill. The class of men who would be benefitted by the exemption would not be the hard working people of this country. He had no objection, however, to the Bill going to the Committee.

Mr. GIBSON (Huron) said he would allow the Bill to go to the Committee, and help to vote it down there. (Laughter.)

The House divided on the motion, with the following result:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Awrey, Badgerow, Balfour, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Cascaden, Chisholm, Commee, Dill, Dowling, Dryden, Ermatinger, Ferguson, Ferris, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gillies, Graham, Hagar, Harcourt, Hardy, Hart, Hawley, McIntyre, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Master, Morin, Mowat, Murray, O'Connor, Pardee, Phelps, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Sills, Young—41.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baskerville, Blezard, Blythe, Brereton, Broder, Caldwell, Carnegie, Clancy, Creighton, Denison, Drury, Fell, French, Gould, Gray, Hammell, Hudson, Kerns, Kerr, Lees, Lyon, McCollman, McGhee, McKay, MacKenzie, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Monk, Morgan, Morris, Mulholland, Neelon, Preston, Robillard, Ross (Cornwall), Snider, Waters, White, Wilmot, Wood—41.

The result being a tie the Speaker was requested to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER—In order to give an opportunity to consider the Bill I will vote for the yeas. (Applause and laughter.)

The motion was therefore carried.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) moved that the order "House in Committee on Bill respecting Lake Scugog Marsh Drain Lands Co." be discharged and the Bill referred back to the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. MEREDITH said he understood that the Committee had refused to fix the capital stock of the company at the amount desired by the promoters. It seemed to him that this was a matter of the internal management of the company.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN said that when the Bill came before the Committee the promoters were unable to explain fully why the increase of the stock was required, but they had now a letter from England with full explanations.

Order discharged, and Bill referred back to Private Bills Committee.

The following Bills were advanced a stage in Committee of the Whole:—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN—Respecting the town of Bowmanville.

Mr. DILL—To incorporate the Nosbonsing & Nipissing Railway Company.

Mr. BALFOUR—To authorize the Law Society of Ontario to admit Delos R. Davis as a barrister-at-law.

Mr. WIDDIFIELD—To incorporate the King Loop Line Railway Company.

Mr. DILL—To incorporate the village of Huntsville.

Mr. WATERS—To incorporate the town of Parkhill.

Mr. BRERETON—Respecting the consolidated debt of the town of Port Hope.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW.

Hon. O. MOWAT moved the first reading of a Bill to provide for the better administration of the law. Carried.

DIVISION COURTS.

Hon. C. F. FRASER moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Division Courts Act. Carried.

PRIVATE BILLS—SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Mr. Badgerow—Respecting the Thunder Bay Colonization Railway Company.

Mr. Fell—Respecting the Irondale, Bancroft, & Ottawa Railway Company.

Mr. Badgerow—To incorporate the Richmond Hill Junction Railway Company.

Mr. Ferris—Respecting a certain agreement between the City of Brantford and the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. Carnegie—To incorporate the Nicoll's Hospital Trust.

Mr. Neelon—To incorporate the St. Catharines Club.

Mr. Carnegie—Respecting the Town of Peterborough.

Mr. Balfour—To incorporate the South Essex Gun Club.

WOMAN FRANCHISE.

Mr. WATERS on moving the second reading of the Bill to grant the franchise to women, said he felt happy—(applause and laughter)—for this reason, that such a Bill could be discussed by the Legislature without being treated as a joke. The qualifications fixed by the Bill were almost identical with those fixed for male voters by the Act of last session. Public opinion had been rapidly advancing in this direction. In 1876, the member for North Perth introduced a Bill giving the franchise to women, which was defeated. In a subsequent session, Dr. Clark introduced a similar Bill, which was again defeated. In 1882, Mr. Lees introduced a Bill giving women the right to vote on money by-laws, which was carried. This he regarded as a most important concession. After the elections of 1883, the full municipal franchise was given to women. He now asked the House to follow the principle

TO ITS LEGITIMATE CONCLUSION,

and grant to women the right to vote at elections for the Legislative Assembly. In the Canadian House of Commons last session, Sir John Macdonald had introduced a Franchise Bill, which gave the franchise to women, and expressed himself as personally in favour of female suffrage. That clause of the Bill, however, was dropped. The suffrage had been granted to women in the Territory of Wyoming and Washington Territory, United States. The matter had been agitated in England since the latter end of the 18th century, and some of the greatest men in that country had given the subject great study. Measures granting suffrage to women had been defeated repeatedly, but the opinion was growing in favour of the change, and he believed that a majority of the members of the House of Commons were now pledged to vote for female suffrage. Its advocates in England had already been so far successful as to secure the franchise for women in municipal elections, and in elections for school trustees. And the place where woman suffrage had been tried was in the Isle of Man, (laughter), and there the influence of the new political element was most happy. He took the broad ground that women should have the franchise because they had a right to it. Women were just as much interested as men in having good laws carried into effect. They were liable to every law, they were subject to every tax—but they had no share in saying how the tax should be imposed, except so far as the municipal franchise gave them that right. It was absurd that a male servant should have a vote, while the woman who