

(Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gilmour, Harcourt, Hardy, Harty, Lockhart, Loughrin, McKay (Oxford), McKechnie, McMahon, Mackenzie, C., Meacham, Moore, Mowat, O'Connor, Paton, Porter, Preston, Rayside, Ross, Sharpe, Sprague, Stratton, Tait, Waters, Willoughby, Wood (Brant), Wylie—53.

Mr. Meredith moved for a return showing the expenditure in each year since the system of fire ranging has been established for that service, the amount of refunds in each year, and the amount remaining unpaid on account of the license share of the expenditure. The motion was adopted.

AT THE RECESS.

After recess the following private bills passed through committee:—To enable Mary Soden to sell certain lands in Guelph; to incorporate the Ontario Ship Railway Company; to incorporate the Town of Thessalon. The following public bills also passed through committee:—To amend the Free Libraries Act; to amend the General Road Companies Act; for the further protection of public interest in rivers, streams and creeks; to amend the Division Courts Act; to prevent the wasting of natural gas. These public bills, except that to amend the Road Companies Act, were also read a third time.

Mr. Balfour moved the second reading of the bill to provide for the admission of women to the study and practise of the law. He said it must have been a matter of surprise to the members that a woman was refused admission to the Law Society, considering that they were admitted to all other branches of higher learning. He read the report of the sub-committee of benchers on the application of Miss Clara Brett Martin showing the ground of refusal was that the Law Society is not permitted by law to grant such an application, the general question of the advisability of women studying law not having been discussed. The present bill confers on the Law Society power to admit women to the study of law. No sound reasons could be advanced against allowing women to practise law if they wish. Women were allowed to study law in Iowa in 1879; Missouri, 1872; North Carolina and California, 1878; Massachusetts, 1882; Pennsylvania, 1886. Many other States have passed such laws, and the United States Congress passed a similar law in 1879. There are now 56 practitioners in the United States. Mr. Balfour showed that women in various States had taken a high place at the bar. He did not understand that the Law Society objected to the bill. Rather than throw difficulties in their way the House should encourage women in their efforts to gain admission to the bar.

Mr. Meredith said he was entirely opposed to the bill. There was no object in passing the bill unless women were going to take advantage of it. If the bill passed the Law Society would be bound to treat women the same as men so far as their qualifications were concerned. If women were admitted to law they would be brought into contest with male lawyers before juries. It would upset the whole equanimity of the twelve good men and true. Unless the bill expressly stated that there should be no fees for consultations, the many consultations with young gentlemen would treble the cost of litigation. He did not believe the women of the Province wanted to study law. Women were not intended for the position of advocate. Nature intended that women should occupy a different position to men in the community. If the House were carried away by gush and sentiment it would be disastrous to the best interests of women.

Mr. Gilmour twitted Mr. Waters with finding the realm he hitherto ruled invaded by Mr. Balfour. Dickens described a lady who practised law, Miss Sallie Brass. The disabilities under which women labored in the practice of medicine were greater than they would be in law. Mr. Gilmour made witty reference to the different qualities of women, showing how well they were suited to the practice of law. He saw no reason why the House should not adopt the bill.

Mr. Wood (Hastings) was in favor of the bill, being convinced of the reasonableness and strength of Mr. Balfour's arguments. Mr. Awrey was opposed to the bill, Mr. Tait supported it and Mr. Whitney opposed it. Mr. Ross saw no reason why women should not be admitted to the study of law, and held that Mr. Meredith, in saying it was a matter of costume, tresses, etc., was belittling a great educational question. Mr. Clancy opposed the bill.

Mr. Hardy opposed the bill because of its far-reaching influence. It was an invitation to the women of the Province to enter a field already overcrowded. Women were not fitted for such a profession. It would be inconvenient to society to admit women to be lawyers. They were not best fitted to fill the highest positions in this profession. He would vote for the bill if it were to allow women to become attorneys. But women were not fitted to be advocates, pleaders, judges. There was a large percentage of causes which women could not on y not try, but when they came up she should gather up her skirts and leave the court.

The vote was then taken on the motion for the second reading. The bill was carried by 41 to 40, as follows:—

Yeas.—Allan, Balfour, Barr (Dufferin), Bishop, Blezard, Caldwell, Carpenter, Charlton, Chisholm, Cleland, Connee, Dack, Davis, Dowling, Ferguson, Field, Garrow, Gibson (Hamilton), Gilmour, Glendinning, Harcourt, Kirkwood, Lockhart Loughrin, McCleary, McKay (Oxford), McKay (Victoria), McMahon, Mack, Marter, Meacham, Moore, Mowat, O'Connor, Rayside, Ross, Sharpe, Sprague, Stratton, Tait, Waters, Wood (Hastings)—41.

Nays—Awrey, Baxter, Biggar, Bush, Barr (Renfrew), Campbell (Algoma), Campbell (Durham), Clancy, Clarke, E. F. (Toronto), Dryden, Fell, Gibson (Huron), Godwin, Guthrie, Hammell, Hardy, Harty, Hiscott, Hudson, Kerns, McColl, McKechnie, McLennaghan, Mackenzie, C., Magwood, Meredith, Miscampbell, Monk, Paton, Preston, Reid, Rorke, Smith (Frontenac), Tooley, White, Whitney, Willoughby, Wood (Brant), Wylie—40.

Mr. Meredith moved that the bill be considered this day three months. The three months' "hoist" was lost 40, to 41, the same division as before.

Mr. Gibson (Hamilton) said the bill should go to the Committee on Laws, to be dealt with there. He might say that while he favored empowering the Law Society to include females as well as males, he did not believe in compelling them to do so.

Mr. Balfour said that if the bill was sent to the committee for a fair consideration, he would agree to accept a measure empowering women to act as attorneys.

Mr. Meredith again urged that no attempt should be made to pass the bill this session. He would oppose it to the fullest extent in his power. The bill was allowed to go to the Committee on Laws on division.

The House then concurred in the report of the Committee of Supply. The following bills were read a second time:—To amend the act respecting landlord and tenant, Mr. Awrey; to amend the Assessment Act, Mr. Awrey. The House then went into committee and passed Mr. Meredith's bill to amend the Ontario Joint Stock Companies Letters Patent Act.

MILK DILUTION.

The House then went into committee on Mr. O'Connor's bill to amend the act providing against frauds in the supplying of milk to cheese or butter manufactories. This bill provides that where milk is diluted the owner will be held liable whether the dilution was the act of an employee or member of his family. It was shown by Mr. Dryden and Mr. O'Connor that anyone could at present escape conviction by claiming ignorance of the act.

Hon. Mr. Ballantyne spoke for the first time this session on this measure. He pointed out the great necessity for securing good milk at the cheese factories, and explained that the present law was defective in that it was impossible to secure convictions for adulteration.

Mr. Waters thought a measure of this kind should be carefully considered before adoption, and Mr. White said it would be reversing the criminal code by putting a man upon the proof of his innocence. The