

that this Act is an infringement upon the rights of our Province. I am speaking now as an Ontario man. The leader of the Government stated this afternoon that the question was whether the representative institutions of our country were to continue or not. We claim that this is a blow at our representative institutions; that the voters' lists for the Province of Ontario have been used ever since Confederation, and there has been no fault found with them, and we claim that there is no system upon which you can obtain a voters' list that is as fair as the present system. We believe that our municipal institutions in Ontario are superior, or at any rate are equal, to any municipal system in the world. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated a few evenings ago, in reply to a remark which I made, that, if the Tory assessors were as unfair as the Reform assessors, I ought to go in with him and pass this law. That is not my experience, and I have had considerable experience in reference to the matter. While I believe there is a certain amount of unfairness on the part of some assessors under the present system, it is not to the extent that hon. gentlemen suppose. The hon. gentleman may, perhaps, be a stronger partizan than I am, which I believe he is, but I have found the assessors, whether Conservative or Reform, usually, at any rate, moderately fair in their assessments; and, rather than see this Bill become law, I would see every assessor a Conservative in the constituency I represent, because, I believe there would be more fairness, and less danger of dishonest actions on the part, especially, of the revising officer. Under this Bill, the revising officer has the full control of the voters' lists, and is acting under instructions from the First Minister. What is to prevent the First Minister, or those who have charge of the appointment of the revising officer, saying to him: I want John Smith to come from this county, and I want Mr. Jones to come from that county, and I want the hon. member for East Durham to stay at home, and the hon. member for Huron need not apply, and so on all the way through the chapter? I think this Bill is, without exception, the most unfair and the most dishonorable that has ever been brought before this House. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), spoke about the Indian clause. Either he did not understand the Bill or I do not understand it. I understand that this Bill enfranchises tribal Indians in the Provinces, Indians who are subject to the control of the agent, who have no deed for their property, who cannot buy and sell, who cannot sue and be sued. If an Indian owns his property, if he has a deed of his property, and that property is separate from any other property, if he can buy and sell property, and can buy and sell anything else, and can sue and be sued, or can be drafted as a militiaman, then an Indian has as much right to vote as a white man. But that is not the way in which I understand this Bill. I have made out a list of various industries of the Province of Ontario, and while am not prepared to say that the statement made by hon. gentlemen who spoke the other evening is correct or is not correct, I am quite satisfied that a large percentage of the men who are referred to in this list will be disqualified. Hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that the difference between \$250 for the wage-earners, and an income of \$400, is a large amount, and that difference will exclude a large number of persons who, under the wage earners clause in the provincial Act, would be enfranchised. I find that of the following classes nearly one-third will be disfranchised under this Bill:

"Cabmen and draymen, carders and weavers, carpenters and joiners, commercial clerks, engineers and machinists, factory operatives, farmers' sons, laborers, lumbermen and raftsmen, carriage builders, sailors, millers, painters and glaziers, plasterers, railroad employees, blacksmiths, saddlers and harness makers, sawyers and millmen, male servants, butchers, boot and shoemakers, stone masons, male teachers, edge-tool makers, teamsters and drivers, telegraph operators, foundrymen, tin and copper-smiths, tailors and clothiers."

Mr. McCRAVEY.

I am certain that so far as my own knowledge goes of many of the above classes—and I have a number of men belonging to some of those classes in my employ—a large proportion of them will be disfranchised under this Bill—I believe one-third.

Mr. RYKERT. How much do you pay them a day?

Mr. McCRAVEY. I pay my men as much wages as other employers of labor; I have as good men as other men have; I have men who have remained with me longer perhaps than they would remain with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). Now, Sir, I consider that in the whole history of Canada this is the worst Bill that has ever been brought before Parliament; and I believe hon. gentlemen will find that the people of this country will speak out in such a manner as will, perhaps, surprise some of them. A few days ago a meeting was held in the city of Toronto, and resolutions were passed condemning this Bill. I am told that quite a large number of Conservatives are signing petitions against the Bill. I have several letters myself stating that certain Conservatives are strongly opposed to this Bill. For the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite I will read this resolution passed at the Toronto meeting:

"That this meeting denounces the proposal of the Dominion Government to establish a separate franchise for elections to the House of Commons:

"1. Because it is entirely unnecessary, in view of the fact that the provincial voters' lists have been always used with complete success for Dominion elections ever since Confederation.

"2. It will cause an enormous additional expense to the country to prepare and keep up a separate set of voters' lists every year in every municipality.

"3. Each Province is the best judge of the qualifications for parliamentary voters to elect its members to the House of Commons.

"4. That the proposed qualification for Dominion voters is entirely different from the qualification of the voters for the Provincial Legislature, and will create confusion and annoyance in every polling subdivision.

"5. In British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, where they now have manhood suffrage, a large number will be disfranchised.

"6. In Ontario the qualification as it now stands embraces a great number of persons whom it is proposed to exclude from the right to vote at the Dominion elections. In cities and towns owners and occupants of property worth \$200 have votes, but the proposed Act will prevent them from voting unless they have property worth \$300. In counties a man can now qualify on property worth \$100—it is proposed to deprive him of a vote unless he has \$150 worth. All who have an income of \$250 can vote now; but it is proposed to exclude all who have not an income of \$400. Every householder can now vote, no matter what his house is worth, but he will be excluded by the present Act, unless he can show the value required above.

"7. The Province of Ontario does not wish to dictate what shall be the qualification for voters in other Provinces, and she will not submit to have the rest of the Dominion dictate what shall be the qualification of voters within Ontario.

"And this meeting earnestly protests against the disfranchisement of the large and intelligent body of electors who have been granted the franchise by the recent Act of the Ontario Legislature."

Now, I want to show the House what the people think about giving the franchise to Indians. I think it is a great outrage to give the franchise to Indians who are now, in open rebellion against the Government of this country, whilst you refuse it to the young men, to our noble volunteers, who are fighting in defence of their country.

Mr. RYKERT. Will the hon. gentleman state what section of the Bill gives a vote to the Indians of the North-West Territories?

Mr. McCRAVEY. If the hon. gentleman will read the Bill he will find out:

"1. That the Indians have not expressed any desire to become enfranchised.

"2. That they are minors in the eyes of the law.

"3. That they are wards of the Crown.

"4. That they are declared by law to be incapable of managing their own affairs.

"5. That they are entirely under the control of the Government agents, through whom they receive their annuities from the Crown.

"6. That they do not share in the responsibilities of municipal or federal government.

"7. That they are not liable for assessment or municipal taxation.