

was an open question. He objected to the hon. gentleman's proposition on various grounds. He objected to the proposition of the bill, because of itself, and he objected to it, because of what it would lead up to. He objected to this mode of dealing with the subject, piece by piece. The House should look the whole question in the face and come to a sensible conclusion upon it. The hon. gentleman had spoken of the petitions presented to the House, but he ventured to say that if any married women did sign that petition they did not know what they were doing; did not know that as a matter of fact they would be depriving their husbands of the votes which they now had by virtue of their wives' property. As he had said he believed that they should look at

#### THE WHOLE QUESTION

of woman suffrage, and in that view he believed his hon. friend's proposition would not stand the test of logic. If they gave women all the privileges of citizenship they must cast upon them all the duties of citizenship. (Applause.) That was no reason why they should not be compelled

#### TO DEFEND THE LAWS,

yet who would propose that a sheriff's posse should be composed partly of women? Possibly if the Scott Act and the question of Prohibition were disposed of they would hear no more of this question of woman suffrage. Yet, in order that Prohibition might be carried, they were asking that women should be given the franchise for all time to come, and to transfer the political power of the country from one sex to the other. He believed that nature never intended that this should be done, and all experience was in favor of his position. He wanted to meet the question squarely, and therefore he moved the six months' hoist.

Mr. WATERS said that the Commissioner of Public Works appeared to be afraid that women would be called upon to act as volunteers and soldiers, or soldieresses—(laughter)—but they all knew that certain men who had votes were exempt from these duties.

Hon. Mr. FRASER said that what he had contented was that women would be liable to such duties to the same extent as men and no farther.

Mr. WATERS said that if the law could exempt certain classes of men it could exempt all women. The Commissioner said that women franchise was desired by those who favored Prohibition. No doubt women would favor laws in favor of Temperance, for they suffered most from intemperance.

Mr. ARMSTRONG said he favored woman suffrage and would vote for the bill.

Mr. WOOD (Hastings) said he favored woman suffrage, but objected to this piecemeal mode of dealing with the question, and would therefore vote for the amendment.

Mr. CRAIG said he intended to make a few remarks on this subject.

A MEMBER—He's making

#### HIS MAIDEN SPEECH

on the married women. (Laughter.)

Mr. CRAIG said he didn't expect to have any trouble with his wife on this question. (Laughter.) She was quite willing that he should do the voting for the family. (Laughter.) He was opposed to the bill. Oh, would an hon. gentleman like to come home and find his wife, instead of getting dinner ready

#### INTERVIEWING A CANDIDATE.

(Laughter.) Hon. gentlemen might laugh, but they would not laugh if they were placed in these circumstances. (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. METCALFE—The other fellow would laugh. (Great laughter.) Mr. Metcalfe said

he would oppose the bill, as tending to delay the millennium, and to destroy the comfort of the home.

Mr. GRAHAM said he was in perfect harmony with this bill. If a married woman had property in her own right she had a perfect right to the franchise. He was surprised to hear the Commissioner of Public Works saying that married women signed petitions which they did not understand. Men could be got

#### TO SIGN ALMOST ANYTHING

in the shape of a petition that was presented to them. He had no doubt he could get men to sign a petition to hang the Commissioner of Public Works; but you would not get many women to sign such a petition. (Laughter.)

Mr. CREIGHTON said that he came to about the same conclusion as the Commissioner for Public Works, but for different reasons. He was in favor of giving the vote to widows and unmarried women, but he was opposed to giving the franchise to married women, because it would interfere with the family relations.

The amendment was carried on the following division:—

YEAS.—Allan, Awrey, Ballantyne, Blezard, Blyth, Bronson, Chamberlain, Clancy, Clarke, E. F. (Toronto), Clarke, H. E. (Toronto), Clarke (Wellington), Connee, Craig, Creighton, Cruess, Dryden, Fell, Fraser, Freeman, French, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Guthrie, Hammell, Harcourt, Hess, Hudson, Ingram, Kerns, Lees, Lyon, McMahon, Master, Meredith, Metcalfe, Miller, Monk, Morgan, Nairn, O'Connor, Pardee, Phelps, Preston, Rayside, Ross (Middlesex), Snider, Stewart, Sprague, Stratton, Tooley, Willoughby, Wilmot, Wood (Hastings), Wood (Brant), Wylie—55.

NAYS.—Armstrong, Balfour, Biggar, Bishop, Dack, Ferguson, Garson, Gilmour, Graham, Leys, McKay, Mack, Marter, Meacham, Morin, Mowat, Ostrom, Smith, Waters—19.

#### INCOME TAX.

Mr. INGRAM moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Assessment Act by increasing the amount of the exemption on incomes from \$400 to \$800.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) said that he had himself introduced a bill to the same effect, but he thought the exemption should be at least \$1,000. Under the present circumstances the poor were taxed much more highly in proportion to their ability than the rich. Poor men's incomes were easily ascertained, while it was very difficult to ascertain the amounts of the larger incomes.

Mr. H. E. CLARKE was opposed to the bill, because he was opposed to all exemptions.

Mr. MEREDITH said that he was opposed to church and other exemptions, but he did not think the exemption of incomes were objectionable on the same grounds as other exemptions. He had opposed this bill, however, because he thought its effect would be to place the great burden of taxation on the classes who were least able to bear it. According to

published statistics the average earnings of workmen in 1884 were \$383, that is within the present exemption. Owing, however, to a large number of petitions in favor of the bill he would vote for the second reading.

Hon. Mr. FRASER said that while they might theorise upon the average earnings of workmen, he thought that those who were asking for this exemption asked it for practical reasons, and the probability was that they had found by an examination of the assessment rolls that the workmen were taxed on their incomes, and would be benefitted by the assessment. He argued at some length against the proposition that churches should be exempt. He had favored the bill last year, and he was in favor of it now.

Mr. GARSON said that he was opposed to all exemptions, and would favor a measure for