

employed him had none. The argument that women did not want the vote was contradicted by the petitions which have come from women during a former session of this Parliament. The sum and substance of the argument against woman suffrage was that it would take woman out of her true place and shock her finer sensibilities. He would be the last individual to do anything which would bring about this, and he proceeded to argue that taking an interest in public affairs would not have this result. He contended that as married women were not included in the Bill no home duties could be neglected or wife unfitted for her sphere. He concluded by stating that in his opinion politics would be purified and the best interests of the whole people would be served.

Mr. DRYDEN opened by remarking that this was a very important political question. The Bill refused the right to married women which it proposed to confer upon single women and widows. For his part he was quite of the opinion of Mr. Gladstone that if the franchise were given to women it must be given to married women also. For instance a woman might be a voter, then marry and be disfranchised; a daughter might vote while her mother could not vote. It was also an incentive to celibacy as to marry would result in the penalty of disfranchisement. Why should a woman be placed in the ruling position? Was it because she had undertaken to exercise her rights in the house or the church? No. And yet they were told that women had the same rights as men. He thought women would not inform themselves sufficiently, and would thus become a dangerous class of voters acting from caprice. Again he thought the effect of women voting would be to degrade them from the elevated position they now hold. In New Jersey women had voted, but the preamble repealing the Act giving them the power set forth the fact that the measure was necessary for the quiet, safety, and good order of the State.

Mr. FERRIS called attention to the fact it was not property which had to vote. As it could be proved that woman was the equal of man in prudence, intelligence, and morals, then she should be placed on an equality with man in all things. Women teach the children and are regarded as well qualified. To show that women did take an interest in politics he stated the fact that in England a million of women had joined a political club. He concluded by supporting the Bill, but expressed the opinion that it did not go far enough.

Hon. O. MOWAT remarked that after this interesting discussion the object of the gentleman would have been attained. He did not pretend to take a view opposed to those of the hon. gentleman. Women were quite as intelligent, and possessed whatever qualifications for voting that men did. He was not afraid of the evils pointed out coming out of the enfranchisement of women. A woman held the highest position in the realm, and was indeed the embodiment of responsible government. Yet the time had not come for giving the voting power to women. They did now exercise considerable influence when they chose to do so. There was no grievance. The laws regarding women were as women desired them to be; women were not asking for the privilege; and therefore there could be no practical grievance. Further, it must be remembered that there was a large proportion of the population shocked at the idea of women voting; thoughtful men of liberal views, and of leading influence in the Province. Now, when the Bill had not the object of removing a practical grievance, and was very obnoxious to a large section of the community, the best plan would be to proceed with caution.

Mr. DRURY said that the promoter of the Bill had taken an inopportune time to press the Bill, as the granting of the franchise to women would greatly increase the difficulty of making up voters' lists, which were now being prepared.

Mr. MEREDITH was strongly opposed to the Bill. It would be a sad day when politics were introduced into the home and women became active politicians. We had recently had an instance of young women actively canvassing in an election campaign, and he was sure it was not desirable that that practice should be extended in this country. If the franchise were granted to women, we could not long really refuse to them the right to sit in this Legislature. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Waters) was a man of cool judgment; but could he be expected to exercise his cool judgment with a young lady of twenty-one years and six months old sitting beside him. (Laughter.)

Mr. WATERS reviewed the arguments against the Bill, promised to force it to a vote at the next Parliament if returned, and asked permission to withdraw the Bill.

On the order for the second reading

Mr. GRAHAM expressed his profound conviction that women should be allowed to

vote just the same as men.

Mr. MEREDITH objected to the order being discharged.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said once give women the right to vote then they must have the right to represent themselves in Parliament. It was within the bounds of possibility that women would form the majority of Parliament; then they might enact a law which every man in the chamber might oppose. What would result? Does he think men would submit to such a law? Social chaos must follow this. Thus women if they had all the rights of men must assume all the responsibilities. They could not think of women of their households attending such trials as himself had had to attend. He proceeded to elaborate the difficulties attendant on the question. Should women be summoned to the defence of the country, go out for eight days' drill? If not why not?

Mr. MEREDITH—Because they would have to bring the babies along. (Laughter.)

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Then we could not consider the babies. He concluded by remarking that he should deplore the day when women should be placed in the anomalous position he contended they would be by giving them the franchise.

Mr. WATERS reviewed the arguments of Hon. C. F. Fraser.

Mr. METCALFE expressed himself in favour of the Bill.

The order for the second reading of the Bill was then withdrawn.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Gould—Inquiry—Whether it is the intention of the Government before the close of this session to amend the law so that the qualification of persons voting at the municipal elections will be the same as that required for persons voting at the Provincial Parliamentary elections?

Hon. Mr. Fraser—Bill to further amend the Division Courts Act.

Mr. Caldwell—Bill to amend the Act respecting Cemetery Companies.

Mr. Carnegie—Inquiry—Whether Mr. P. Jamieson, the tenant of a portion of the Agricultural Hall, Toronto, has as yet repaid the whole or any part of the money expended by this Province in 1882 in making improvements on that building, which Mr. Jamieson's lease required him to make at his own expense, and which expenditure, according to the estimate of the Chief Architect of the Public Works Department, amounts to \$2,031 80, and if not, why not?

Mr. Balfour—Bill to amend the Line Fences Act.