

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

Sixth Parliament, Second Session.

(By Our Own Reporter.)

WEDNESDAY, March 21, 1888.

The Speaker took the chair at eleven o'clock.

THIRD READINGS.

The following bills were read a third time:—

To authorise the trustees of the Toronto General Burying Grounds to sell certain lands—Mr. E. F. Clarke.

Respecting the maintenance of wives deserted by their husbands—The Attorney-General.

For the prevention of accidents by fire in hotels and other public buildings—Mr. McKay.

Respecting Muskoka and Parry Sound—The Attorney-General.

To amend the law as to executions—The Attorney-General.

To amend the Municipal Act—Mr. Hardy.

Respecting mortgages or sales of chattels in Nipissing—The Attorney-General.

To amend the Assessment Act—Mr. O'Connor.

WOMEN'S FRANCHISE.

Mr. WATERS moved the second reading of the bill to give widows and unmarried women the right to vote for members of the Legislative Assembly. He quoted the opinions of Disraeli and Jacob Bright in favor of woman suffrage, and also the testimony of American statesmen to the effect that female suffrage had been successful and beneficial in those States where it had been adopted. He read a letter from Speaker Carlisle's secretary giving Mr. Carlisle's opinion that from the experience of woman suffrage in the United States there was no objection to giving women equal rights with men in this respect. Mr. Waters said that during last session and the present session he had presented petitions from 20,000 persons in favor of the measure he was promoting. In proof of the fact that women valued the franchise he showed that 4,659 women voted in the municipal elections of 1886, and 8,275 women voted in the municipal elections of 1887. There was not an item of legislation of the Assembly which did not affect the female taxpayer. It might be said that the members of this Legislature represented their wives. But what member could say that he represented any widow or unmarried woman. (Laughter.) It was impossible to show that any harm had resulted from any measure of suffrage that had been granted to women. (Applause.)

Hon. C. F. FRASER said that the logical result of the hon. gentleman's proposition and of the hon. gentleman's argument was universal suffrage. The foundation of the suffrage was not property, as the hon. gentleman suggested, but the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. The men of Ontario were allowed to make its laws, because they might be called upon to administer and enforce those laws, and it was ridiculous to suppose that all those duties and responsibilities could be performed by women.

Mr. ARMSTRONG spoke in favor of woman suffrage, and Mr. MEREDITH, Mr. CRAIG and Mr. WOOD, of Hastings, opposed it.

Hon. O. MOWAT said he had a great deal of sympathy with the objects of the bill. He would go farther than the promoter of the bill and say that women were a great deal better than men. He did not agree with the arguments of the Minister of Public Works, but he thought public opinion was hardly yet ripe for granting the suffrage to women.

Hon. Mr. FRASER withdrew a motion for the previous question, which he had moved, and a vote was taken upon the second reading of the bill, which was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Allan, Armstrong, Balfour, Bishop, Creighton, Cruess, Dack, Drury, Ferguson, Field, Garson, Graham, Ingram, Leys, McAndrew, McKay, Mack, Marter, Meacham, Metcalfe, Miller, Morin, Ostrom, Robillard, Rorke, Ross (Huron), Sprague, Stratton, Waters, Wylie—30.

NAYS.—Messrs. Awrey, Ballantyne, Blezard, Blyth, Clancy, Clarke (Northumberland), Clarke, H. E. (Toronto), Conmee, Craig, Dryden, Fell, Fraser, Freeman, French, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gilmour, Hammill, Harcourt, Hardy, Hess, Hudson, Kerns, Lees, Lyon, McLaughlin, Master, Meredith, Monk, Morgan, Mowat, Murray, Nairn, Pacaud, Phelps, Preston, Rayside, Ross (Middlesex), Snider, Stewart, Tooley, Whitney, Widdifield, Wilmot, Wood (Hastings), Wood (Brant)—46.

PROTECTION OF GAME.

The House went into committee on the bill to amend the Act for the protection of game and fur-bearing animals.

A discussion arose on the clause providing that deer, etc., are not to be hunted prior to 1895 except by persons resident in the Province.

Mr. MURRAY held that this would be very hard on American visitors to the Province. He moved to strike out the clause.

The amendment was put and lost, and the bill was reported to the House.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. CLARKE (Wellington) presented the report of the Public Accounts Committee, which was read by the assistant clerk of the House.

On motion of Mr. MEREDITH the report was allowed to stand until the afternoon.

It being one o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After recess, a number of bills were put through committee with the intention of reading them a third time in the evening and a number of orders were discharged.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The supplementary estimates were brought down, considered in committee and concurred in by the House.

At the evening session the following bills were read the third time and passed:—

To enable Emily Rebecca Winstanley to sell certain lands—Mr. Widdifield.

Respecting Manitoulin Island—The Attorney-General.

To establish manhood suffrage for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario—The Attorney-General.

To amend the Act for the protection of game and fur-bearing animals—Mr. Phelps.

To amend the Act respecting mortgages—Mr. French.

To provide for the incorporation of cheese and butter manufacturing associations—Mr. Wood (Hastings).

Respecting conditional sales of chattels—Mr. Nairn.

To amend the Ditches and Watercourses Act—Mr. Nairn.

Respecting Cemetery Companies—Mr. Garson.

To provide against frauds in the supplying of milk to cheese and butter manufactories—Mr. Ballantyne.

Respecting creameries—Mr. Graham.

To amend the Act to secure to wives and children the benefit of life assurance—Mr. Guthrie.

The remaining resolutions reported from committee of Supply were concurred in.

PROROGATION.

Hon. O. MOWAT said that owing to the backward state of printing, prorogation would take place until Friday. He moved that the House adjourn until 2 p. m. Friday.

The House adjourned at 9.10 p. m.

ASSEMBLY NOTES.

THE PAPERS relating to the claim of Messrs. Darling & Carry, architects, for preparing plans, etc., for the new Parliament buildings, have been brought down. They show that after a long correspondence the Department of Public Works awarded \$5,000 to the architects as compensation for the work they had done.

THE REPORT of the bursar of Toronto University has been presented. The investments constituting the permanent fund of the institution amount to \$1,041,547, and the income from them is \$71,900. The amount paid for salaries, fellowships, etc., was \$43,807 68.

DISPUTED TERRITORY:—The correspondence relating to the land and timber in the "Disputed Territory" was brought down yesterday. It comprises numerous despatches and letters between the two Governments, those coming from the Provincial authorities being in most cases full and fair presentations of certain facts, while those emanating from the Dominion authorities are sometimes laconic almost to rudeness. The most important contribution appears to be a memorandum of some length sent by the Attorney-General under date of 28th May, 1887, in reply to a suggestion made a few weeks prior to that date in favor of a joint commission being appointed by the two Governments to exercise control in the disputed points. The memorandum refers to the numerous delays that had already at that time taken place in connection with the settlement of the dispute in question, all the delays being consequent upon the action or inaction of the Dominion Government. It points out also that even a joint commission had been previously suggested and discussed, but negotiations had been dropped by the Dominion Government. The memorandum concludes with the following sentences:—"How long it would take to get the preliminaries of a joint commission settled, if they could be settled; or how long to get the joint commissioners to dispose of claims if they could dispose of them, or how long it would take for the Dominion Government to concur in carrying out the decisions arrived at, if there should be such decisions, it is impossible to foresee, but judging from the past it is manifest that the delay would be far greater than the time necessary for obtaining the decision of the Privy Council on the question which the Dominion Government are now litigating; while the practical effect of the commission would be to prevent meanwhile a single patent from being issued unless the Dominion Government and Dominion commissioners chose. Now that our western boundary has the support of the order of her Majesty in Council and our ownership the judgment in our favor of the High Court and the Court of Appeal, and in view of the policy of delay which in the important particulars mentioned in this memorandum the Dominion Government have persistently pursued for nearly nine years, and in view also of the other considerations which the undersigned (Hon. O. Mowat) has stated, he is of opinion that it is not prudent and would be in opposition to the interests of settlers for us to resume now the negotiations for a joint commission. The undersigned is of opinion that, instead of that course, grants should be made under the Great Seal of the Province to all settlers who are entitled to grants, and who shall prefer to take provisional patents at once without the concurrence of the Dominion Government, rather than wait for the further decision of Her Majesty's Council."

Although this was written on the 28th of May, 1887, nearly six months later—16th November, 1887—in a letter to the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Chapleau still refers to "the proposed joint commission," as if negotiations for its appointment were in progress, though such does not appear from the correspondence to have been the case. An Order in Council in favor of a joint commission was also approved of by the Governor-General on the 2nd of November, 1887. As late as the 5th of January of the present year the Lieutenant-Governor wrote the Home Government expressing regret "that at this late date, when all the Canadian Courts have decided in favor of the Province, the Government of this Excellency is not prepared to accede to either of the suggestions made in my predecessor's despatch, which were made in view of the judicial decision in favor of the Provincial right, namely, that the Dominion Government should now abandon its claim; or that without abandoning it the Dominion Government should now announce its intention of recognising all Provincial patents which may be issued before its appeal from the