the only sons of proprietors to whom votes were given. The law was so understood for a number of years. The recent Act in Ontario gives votes to the sons of land owners, where the amount of land is sufficient to give it to them, irrespective of the use to which the property is put. Now, the hon. gentleman is proposing to do the same thing, and he uses the expression farmers' sons as to plots of land of twenty acres or upwards. As this expression reads, it is perfectly clear that it would be open to the construction which is put upon it by my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake). If the land was not used as a farm, it would give the owner and the son of the owner a vote; but if it was used as a farm, they would not be entitled to vote. I think this portion of the Bill will have to be recast before it will accomplish the purpose the hon. gentleman has in view.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the definition itself, and also sub-section 7 of section 3, are unnecessary, because the greater includes the less, and sub-section 8 of section 4 includes the farmer's son. If you take out of sub-section 8 of section 4 the words "other than a farm," it will apply to any property. But if the hon. gentleman is determined to keep it in, I would call his attention to the fact that he is limiting the owner to a person holding in fee simple and in possession, thereby excluding a large class of owners throughout the country, who do not hold their property in fee simple or in free and common soccage. If he would make the clause read, "owner or occupant thereof," he would embrace those classes who hold their land by other tenures.

Mr. MILLS. The clause at present will exclude the sons of persons in Manitoba who have taken up lands as homesteads, and who have not yet been three years upon them, and taken out their patents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was a considerable stretch of principle when the Province of Ontario extended the franchise to farmers' sons. It did so upon the ground, however, that the farmer, whose son was to vote, was the owner, not the occupant; and as it was known that the common practice was, at any rate, for one of the sons, who expected to be his father's heir, to work with him, while the other sons struck out for themselves or were provided for by their father elsewhere, it was thought that such a one should have a vote. But it would be going very far to say that the son of a mere occupant, having no present interest in his father's estate, should have a vote. The hon. gentleman says a farmer's son in Manitoba would be cut off before the patent was issued. Well, I should not think the farmer's son should have a vote under those circumstances. It does not at all follow that the homesteader will ever get his title; he may forfeit it · he is earning his title, and he is only an occupant until he gets it. His son has no present interest. The difficulty the hon. gentleman mentions could amount to nothing in Manitoba, because if the son is old enough to have a vote he can go on to the next lot and homestead it for himself; there is no necessity for his voting on his father's occupancy. The definition of a land owner in the Ontario Act is:

"The expression 'land holder' shall mean and include any person who is the owner of real property of at least twenty acres in extent, or at least of an actual value in cities and towns of $400, and in townships and incorporated villages of $200."

Mr. CASEY. That includes every land holder who would have enough property to vote in his own right; and the sons of any person who is qualified to vote in his own right are also qualified to vote along with him; but in the hon. gentleman's Bill the property must be sufficient in value to qualify the owner in himself and the sons in themselves. When the interest of the homesteader is sufficient to qualify himself, I do not see the reason why the same sort of interest should not qualify his sons.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is very little chance of difficulty arising in Manitoba from the farmers sons of an occupant not getting a vote, because that would be a very rare case in which the son would not have a holding of his own, the land being practically obtained there for nothing; but in the Province of Ontario there are a great many farmers who do not hold their farms as free holders in free and common soccage. In Huron and Bruce, in some of the newer townships, the patents, in 10 or 20 per cent. of the holdings, have not been issued, and the farms are simply held under a license of occupation. In two or three townships in the riding I represent, and also in the east riding of Huron, a large number of the farmers hold simply under license of occupation from the Crown. Some of them have been so held for twenty-five years, the patents never having been taken out; in some of the cases the land has been paid in full; in others it has not. Yet, by the definition the First Minister gives of farmer and farmers' sons, it is quite manifest that, applying the strict letter of the law, the sons of these men, who hold under license of occupation from the Crown, would not be entitled to vote. Under the 5th sub-section of section 4, the farmers would be entitled to vote themselves, because they are *bonâ fide* occupants of real property in the electoral district, under license of occupation from the Crown, but their sons would not have the right to vote. As I understand the First Minister, he does not think it right the sons of the mere occupants of land should have the right to vote. I do not agree in that view. Take, for instance, the county of Huron. The hon. gentleman knows the fine class of farmers that are there, and yet I venture to say 80 per cent. of them have not taken out their patents, but hold their land merely under license of occupation from the Crown. The suggestion of the hon. member for Queen's, with respect to this sub-section will cover the case. The word "farm" should be held to mean the land actually occupied by the owner or occupant; and then, by the amendment made to the sub-section interpreting farmers' sons, adding to the word "owner" the word "occupant," that would cover the whole case; and unless the hon. gentleman puts that in I fear a large number of the sons of farmers who have no other qualification will not be allowed to vote.

Mr. WELDON. This clause, I think, is unnecessary. In New Brunswick persons make application for land under certain conditions. They get an interest in that land, which they can dispose of, although the Crown grant has never been issued to them at all. They may sell their right in it, although it may be years before any grant issues; they never become freeholders in free and common socage, although they have a license in the land and a vested right in it which they can dispose of. This is a new franchise. It would seem that in Ontario a vote was given to what they call farmers' sons, and it was confined to farmers' sons; but this Bill goes beyond that; it gives the right to vote to the son of the owner of real property, where the real property is sufficient to qualify the father and the son, or the two sons, as the case may be. In the 4th section there is a distinction between the farmers' sons and the owner of real property. The definition of a farm is that it must not be less than twenty acres, but a man might possess nineteen acres and his sons would have the right to vote under the 8th sub-section of section 4, if the property were worth the amount required, whether as a farm or not. The definition of a farm was therefore totally unnecessary, and it will raise the question as to whether a property shall be dealt with as a farm or not. In the one case, the farmer's son would not have a vote, while in the other he would.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the permission of the committee, I will allow this to stand over.