Ontario is called a parish in New Brunswick, and there is no township at all in New Brunswick, I am told. This definition will be very confusing in the Province of New Brunswick; in fact, it would not be applicable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Parishes in New Brunswick must either have been created by civil or ecclesiastical authority, no matter which. This must apply to either, of course.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly not. The hon. gentleman will see that neither of these definitions, nor the enacting clause, would give the slightest intimation to any party which parish was meant. Suppose this question were to arise: Is this Act in New Brunswick applicable to a civil or an ecclesiastical parish? The answer to the hon. gentleman would be: It is applicable to both. So it is, but it is not with both these that the hon. gentleman intends to deal. The hon. gentleman wants it applicable to the civil parish and not to the other. He wants a definition that will include one and exclude the other, in New Brunswick. While this definition may satisfy Quebec, it will not satisfy New Brunswick.

Mr. WELDON. In New Brunswick a parish is exactly what you call a township in Ontario. They are created by statute, and out of them is carved, by the civil authority, what are called ecclesiastical parishes. It is created, not by ecclesiastical authority, but by the Legislature of New Brunswick, and out of that civil division might be carved one or two parishes for ecclesiastical purposes only. In Ontario you have cities, towns and incorporated villages, which, I presume, cover all the divisions there, while the parish, with us, would simply mean a parish which had been erected for civil purposes by the civil authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see how the question can well arise, whether it did or did not arise long ago, between Upper and Lower Canada. When this clause was in the Act it was quite well understood. In Ontario the division is by township, while in Lower Canada it is by parishes, although for ecclesiastical purposes there are parishes in Ontario. But will this meet the hon. gentleman's view:

Parish means any tract of land which is generally reputed to form a parish, whether it has been wholly or in part originally erected into a parish by the civil or ecclesiastical authority, and which now exists as a territorial division.

On paragraph 12, "farmers' sons,"

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have an amendment to this clause, which I will read:

Farmer's son means any male person not otherwise qualified to vote' being a son, grandson, stepson or son-in-law, and an owner or occupant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The son of an occupant ought not to vote, because he has got no title whatever.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In some of the western towns men who have been living upon farms with, perhaps, 60 or 70 acres cleared, for 25 years, have never taken out a patent; yet they are under licensed occupation from the Crown, with their sons living with them. Now why, in cases of that kind, should not the occupant's son have a right to vote just as well as if his father had taken out a patent? In some townships parties have not taken out patents although they have been in occupation 25 years. Some have paid in full and some have not. The question has not arisen yet, but it well arise under this clause; and the effect will be that in some townships the sons of the occupants will be entitled to vote, while in other townships they will not have that right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that we are greatly enlarging the franchise that now exists in Ontario.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The word "owner" will signify a proprietor in his own right, or in the right of his wife, of freehold estate, legal or equitable, in lands and tenements held in free and common soccage, of which such person is in actual possession. As to a landholder, we must look back at the interpretation given. The hon. gentleman will see that an occupant has a right, because he is in peaceable possession. The title of the father is only the title of occupancy, and as the son has no title to occupancy, he should not have a right to vote. The hon. member has mentioned that, in western Ontario, a number of persons have not taken out their patents. We have a right to believe that they would have taken out their patents if something did not remain to be performed towards the Crown; and if anything is required to be so performed, they should perform that condition before their sons should vote upon an estate, which he may perhaps forfeit for non performance of the conditions of occupancy. We must keep the principle as clearly limited as it is in the Ontario Act, that sons should only vote as owners, or if their fathers are proprietors of estates for life or for a larger interest.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The word "owner" in this Bill means a person who holds freehold estate in free and common soccage. The interpretation of the word "owner" in the Ontario Act is a proprietor, either in his own right or the right of his wife, of an estate for life or a larger interest. I contend, in regard to such estates, as I mentioned, they would be in each case an equitable estate, because the parties would have a right against the Crown to get their deeds the moment certain conditions were performed. Under the Ontario Act the sons of such owner will have votes; but under the interpretation of the present Bill it is quite clear that the sons of licensees will not be entitled to vote.

Mr. VAIL. There are quite a number of persons in Nova Scotia who, I think, although fairly entitled to vote under the operation of this Bill, will not possess that right. We have a large number of persons, more particularly in Cape Breton, who are merely squatters on the land, but who have paid to the Government nearly all the amount due. A small sum only requires to be paid to enable them to receive their patents. Under this interpretation the father only will be entitled to vote, and not the son. The father is, to all intents and purpose, owner of the property, and his son will be deprived of a vote, although his father holds his property on a title equal to free and common soccage.

Mr. DAVIES. A large number of persons in Prince Edward Island agreed to purchase land from the Government, and if they have not taken out their deeds the sons will not have votes. I do not think the hon. gentleman intended that. Probably the state of the law in the Lower Provinces was not brought before his attention. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has called attention to cases where men, who have been in possession of land for wenty, thirty or forty years, do not take out patents, because their present title is almost equally good, yet the sons of those men will not have votes.

Mr. TROW. There are many scores of cases in North Perth, where farmers holding property of the value of, perhaps, $6,000, have not taken out patents, because, perhaps, $100 was due, and payment has been deferred from year to year. This clause would deprive the sons of such men of the right to vote.

Mr. MILLS. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to a class of cases in this city which would not come under this provision, namely, those of parties who have perpetual leases of military property. The hon. gentleman knows that you cannot dispossess them; that they have a right to