

out the saloons. Why should women not have a vote with reference to more than one vice which was tolerated?

#### Against the Vote.

Mr. A. E. Donovan (Brockville) declared that women's suffrage prevailed in only about eight States in the Union, and it was strange that Mormonism obtained in some of these. In one State only 27 per cent. of the women had voted when given the franchise. He did not believe there was any place in the world where the laws were better than in the Province of Ontario. "If the time comes," he declared, "I hope we shall have manly, whole-hearted courage. Instead of dealing out in piecemeal, if we are going to give the women the vote, give it so that all shall have the franchise."

#### The Opposition Leader.

Mr. Rowell thought the member for South Wellington very mildly characterized the Attorney-General's view by saying it was a Conservative view. He (Mr. Rowell) would describe it as the good old Tory view of the situation. Dealing with Mr. Lucas' assertion that property had nothing to do with the vote, the Opposition leader drew attention to the bill which had given corporations a vote on money by-laws. Married women had the school board vote, and unmarried women and widows had the municipal vote, and would anybody say anything but good had come from it?

"If the municipal franchise were extended to married women local option would be carried in municipalities where it was now defeated by only a small majority. Then there would be something done to the shops which the Attorney-General opposes when he talks and is in favor of when he votes."

## MUNICIPALITIES HAVE RIGHT TO OBJECT

### Further Debate Over Municipal Rights Pertaining to Highway Bill in Legislature

Municipal rights have suddenly loomed large in the Legislature since the Toronto-Hamilton highway bill was first introduced into the House. For the third time the select committee appointed to consider the measure met yesterday morning, and for a third time representatives of the municipalities argued over traffic regulation, apportionment of cost and maintenance, and now the bill has to stand over until Friday, without any chance of being passed this week.

The power to be given to the Commission to regulate traffic seemed to be the most serious obstacle. Councillor Waldbrook of Trafalgar, speaking as such, did not intend that the rights of the municipality should be taken away.

"The act does not take away the rights of the municipalities," said Mr. Gooderham. "It gives the Commission power to construct the highway and maintain it in a proper way."

"If I wanted to take a traction engine over the road I could not do it without the consent of the Commission," Mr. Waldbrook replied.

#### To Apply Through Local Council.

Hon. T. W. McGarry endeavored to make clear the intention of the traffic clauses, and said application in this instance would be made through the local Council to the Commission.

Reeve Pugsley, representing the York County Highway Boards, found municipal rights again invaded by

permitting the Commission to take over the bridges and pay the proportion towards making them strong enough to stand heavy traffic.

#### A Halt Called by Mr. McGarry.

Here Mr. McGarry stopped the discussion. "There has been considerable discussion about the rights of municipalities being taken away. For the past fifty years the Government has taken over these bridges and maintained them, and not a word has been said. You cannot expect the Government to contribute to a highway of this kind, involving such an expenditure, unless it is able to clothe its Commission with sufficient powers to administer the road."

#### Opportunity to Object.

Mr. T. Herbert Lennox, as a ratepayer, raised the point of the county having to pay for the rebuilding of a bridge that had been up only a few years.

It was finally decided that before a bridge could be rebuilt the municipalities would have an opportunity to object to the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board.

Fault was found with other sections. The restriction of cattle driving raised another protest, but Mr. McGarry again assured the rural representatives that proper regulations only would be invoked.

#### Provincial Treasurer Gets Mad.

Reeve Porter of Trafalgar drew Mr. McGarry's ire when he insinuated that that township did not consent to pay \$4,000 per mile towards the cost of the road.

"You say that you did not agree to pay the \$4,000 per mile," queried the Provincial Treasurer, "and that you were only willing to pay the lump sum of \$18,000? Now, why did you allow the plans to get this far before you said anything? It is because you wanted to get Mr. Morden on the Commission and failed? You passed a resolution in favor of the \$4,000 per mile. You also mentioned in that resolution that you would like Mr. Morden to be a member of the Highway Commission. Now that you have found that Mr. Morden was not given a place on the Commission you come here and raise objection to the \$4,000 per mile."

"No; that isn't the reason. We were never willing to pay \$4,000 as provided by the act."

The point was also raised that the cities of Toronto and Hamilton should bear a portion of the cost, if any, above \$600,000, and the entire excess should not be assessed back upon the land along the highway.

The committee will meet again on Friday morning.