

Rowell showed that it did not place married women on the same basis as widows and spinsters. His hon. friend's bill would include all married women who owned property in their own right, and occupant of houses who held a five-year lease. It did not include provision for all married women who were wage-earners, and if there was one woman above another who should have the privilege of voting it was the woman who, for reasons it was unnecessary to detail, went to work. Dissecting the bill introduced by Mr. Macdiarmid, the leader of the Opposition showed that before a woman under its provisions could get the right to vote she virtually had to put her husband on the Indian list. He thought that placed the wife in an invidious position. If they were going to give women votes they ought to do so without imposing such hampering conditions. Mr. Elliott's bill placed married women on the same basis as widows and spinsters, and he respectfully urged upon the Government to send it along with the bill of Mr. Macdiarmid to the committee, in order that the bill of the member for West Elgin might be modified. He was proceeding on the assumption that the Government were in favor of some change in the municipal laws. His hon. friend (Sir James Whitney) had stated property was the basis of the franchise in municipal elections. If the vote was based on property qualifications there was absolutely no reason why married women should not stand in exactly the same position as widows and spinsters.

Mr. Hanna Criticizes.

Hon. W. J. Hanna attempted to criticize the bill. It looked as if it had been prepared hurriedly and without proper consideration as to where it would lead to. It was also inconsistent. It either went too far or not far enough. He was sure it was not a bill that even the warmest friends of the suffragists would support in its present form.

Mr. Proudfoot (Centre Huron) followed Mr. Johnston (Hastings West), who was not in favor of votes for women in Provincial elections at present, but thought the time was coming when the franchise would be extended to them. Mr. Proudfoot wondered why the Provincial Secretary did not suggest amendments to the bills under consideration if they did not quite satisfy him. He declared the Provincial Secretary had sidestepped the questions raised by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Studholme's Argument.

Mr. Allan Studholme contributed to the general discussion with an animated speech in support of the principle of his bill for the full Provincial franchise. He linked up the question of the female franchise with the program for social and industrial betterment, with the minimum wage and child welfare. He styled the expression "in our wisdom" as self-conceit, and declared that no man was in a position to say there was no demand on the part of women for the ballot. He wanted to know what evidence the Government desired to prove that women wanted the franchise. They had got tired sending deputations, and the Prime Minister had said that petitions did not count. Would the Government have the women of Ontario adopt the same tactics as their sisters had in England? He would not quarrel with the statement that woman's place was in the home, but how could the 8,000,000 factory and shop girls in Canada and the United States find a home influence until progress was made in social reform, and this alone could be accomplished by the influence of the ballot. This had been the result in Australia and New Zealand.

An Election Question.

The debate concluded with Mr. Proudfoot taking issue with Sir James Whitney's statement that the question of extending the franchise to include women was not before the country at the last election. He had stood on many platforms where the subject had been advocated. If corporations were entitled to representation in the ballot, surely the same privilege should be extended to women. It was clear that the combined influence of a married woman and her husband at the polls would be destructive to the li-

quor traffic in local option campaigns, for instance. "It is because their friends the liquor interests do not want the vote given to women that the Government are opposing the bill," said Mr. Proudfoot.

Mr. T. Marshall (Monck) introduced a little humor into the debate by showing the added interest that would be given to politics when the ladies were interested. There would be no difficulty in securing attendance at political meetings, and on campaigns members of the fair sex would be congenial company. He moved in amendment that the motion for the second reading be changed, that the House recognized the advantage that would ensue from the extension of the franchise, and asked for a special committee to inquire into the whole question during the recess.

Both the amendment and the main motion were lost on division.

The Five Million Stays Sealed.

Late in the evening a motion that the House go into Committee of Supply was met by Mr. Proudfoot with an amendment that the method of spending the \$5,000,000 for New Ontario was subversive of the principles of responsible government. The motion was indicative of the Opposition's intention to pursue the action of the Government on this matter as constituting a serious departure from all constitutional practice.

In support of his amendment Mr. Proudfoot said \$5,000,000 was being spent by the Government and the Opposition was denied information as to how it was being spent. They had as much right as the Ministers to know what was going to be done with the money. He contended that the way in which the Government was dealing with the grant struck at the root of responsible government.

Hon. Mr. Hearst pooh-poohed the idea that the question was an important one.

Mr. Sam Clarke (Northumberland West) wanted to know what was the use of the entire House considering the estimates if the Government could take \$5,000,000 and spend it as they liked.

Mr. Z. Mageau (Sturgeon Falls) continued the discussion, saying that the Government did not intend to spend a dollar of the money in his constituency.

Shortly before midnight Mr. Proudfoot's amendment was defeated on a vote of 46 to 14.

Legislature Expresses Ontario's Sympathy

Before the orders of the day were called in the Legislature yesterday Sir James Whitney drew attention to the loss by flood and fire in the neighboring States, and proposed, seconded by Mr. Rowell, the following resolution:

"That this House desires to tender to the Government and people of the State of Ohio and the other States of the Union, where the loss of life and property from floods have been very great, the warm sympathy of this Province and of the Legislative Assembly."