

addressed myself to the French Canadians and warned them, and then voted for female suffrage. Sir, I did address myself to the French Canadians, and warned them that if they allowed this Bill to be passed, the very thing I voted for, as well as universal suffrage and perhaps other objectionable things would be forced on Quebec, and that if they wished to avoid universal suffrage or female suffrage, it behoved them to keep in their own hands the power they possessed, and not throw down the barrier that prevented the other Provinces from forcing upon them a suffrage they do not desire. Then the hon. gentleman says Ontario demands that her suffrage shall be forced on the Dominion. Ontario demands nothing of the kind. Ontario demands that her suffrage shall be respected in the Province of Ontario, and that every other Province shall have the liberty that Ontario demands of fixing the suffrage to suit the wishes of its own people. That is what we demand. We have no desire or expectation that the suffrage of Ontario shall be accepted in any Province except Ontario. Then, the hon. gentleman says no person shall be disfranchised in Ontario who has a vote to-day, and that the Bill passed by the Ontario Legislature last Session will not come into force until the 1st of January next. When does this Bill come into force?—on the 1st of January following. In making the assertion he did, the hon. gentleman sought to create a false impression. The Bill now under consideration, when it comes into operation, will supplant the Bill lately passed and then in operation in Ontario and will disfranchise scores of thousands of people who will then be enfranchised by the Ontario Act. So much for the points made by the hon. gentleman. I rose just to refer to a few statements made by the hon. First Minister, and chiefly to the charge that the Opposition have obstructed legislation, which I deny.

Mr. McCRAANEY. I did not intend on this occasion to say a word; but I feel that I owe a deep responsibility to my constituents and to myself to say something on this question. I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln, and I must confess that I have been somewhat surprised at some of the statements he has made. The hon. gentleman referred to the Franchise Bill that is now before the House, and to the Franchise Bill which has been passed recently in the Ontario Legislature, and drew a comparison between the two, and I think was very unfair in that comparison. He stated there would be none or very few disfranchised under this Bill. He stated also that there were only some 50,000 persons over twenty-one years of age in this Province who were not already enfranchised. I do not understand, for my part, how the hon. gentleman could come to any such conclusion. I find that, practically, under the Ontario Act, when it comes into force, we will have manhood suffrage. I know of no class of persons that will not be enfranchised if they are earning \$250 per annum. Let me read some few clauses of the Ontario Act.

Firstly.—Every male person entered on the revised assessment roll upon which the voters' list to be used at the election is based for any city, town, incorporated village or township, for real property of the value hereinafter mentioned, and being at the time of the final revision and correction of said assessment roll, and also at the time of the election, a resident of and domiciled within the Electoral District for which he claims to vote.

(2) Such person must (subject to the provisions hereinafter contained) have been rated on such assessment roll as the owner, tenant or occupant of real property of the actual value of not less than the following:—

In cities and towns, two hundred dollars;

In incorporated villages and townships, one hundred dollars:

(3) Where any real property is owned or occupied jointly by two or more persons, and is rated at an amount sufficient, if equally divided between them, to give a qualification to each, then each of them shall be deemed rated within this Act, otherwise none of them shall be deemed so rated.

Secondly.—Every male person who is residing at the time of the election in the local municipality in which he tenders his vote and has resided therein continuously since the completion of the last revised

assessment roll of the municipality, and derives an income from some trade, occupation, calling, office or profession of not less than two hundred and fifty dollars annually, and has been assessed for such income in and by the assessment roll of the municipality upon which the voters' list used at the election is based.

Thirdly.—Every male person entered on the last revised assessment roll as a wage-earner who is residing at the time of the election in the local municipality in which he tenders his vote, and has resided therein continuously since the completion of the last revised assessment roll of the municipality, and who has during the twelve months next prior to being so entered, derived or earned wages or income from some trade, occupation, calling, office, or profession of not less than two hundred and fifty dollars.

(2) In estimating or ascertaining the amount of wages or income so earned or derived by any person so entered as a wage-earner in the assessment roll of a municipality, not being a city, town or village, the fair value of any board or lodging furnished or given to or received or had by such person as or in lieu of wages or as part thereof shall be considered or included.

So that any person who is earning, any farm laborer who is earning \$150 a year with his board, will be entitled to a vote. Practically this means manhood suffrage. I will also, with your permission, Sir, read the speech of the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill in the Local House, the hon. Mr. Fraser. He said:—

"I say that this Bill is going far towards conferring the franchise upon every resident in the Province who is twenty-one years of age. The broadest basis of all is that which is included in the word householder. Hereafter if this Bill becomes law every man who is a tenant, every man who occupies a separate dwelling house, even though it only be a part of one house, so long as it has a separate entrance, no matter who occupies it, whether as a tenant, occupant or owner, no matter what its value may be, will hereafter, provided that it is his residence in the sense in which this Act requires, have the right to vote. Now, hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, will see what a vast advance that is on the law as it stands to-day. The Act now provides that no man can vote unless he has \$400 worth of property in cities, \$300 worth in towns, and \$200 worth in incorporated villages and townships. Hereafter there will be no question of rental at all. Hereafter there will be required nothing of a voter except that he rates as a householder. Well, then, next to that the broadest basis, I think, is that which gives the right to vote to every man who has \$300 by way of income or wages. Hereafter the right to vote was limited to an income of \$400 and then it could only be exercised by those who were so assessed who paid the taxes to which they were liable to being assessed. So in these two features we have extended the franchise so as to make it almost equal to manhood suffrage. It would be extremely hard to find any class in this country who, under one or other of these broad provisions of which I am speaking, will not have the qualifications necessary to entitle them to vote at parliamentary elections. But we are extending the franchise in other directions. Hereafter every man who is assessed for \$200 in cities and towns, whether as owner, tenant or occupant, will be entitled to vote, and in incorporated villages and townships the assessed value will be reduced to \$100. The farmer's sons franchise will be no longer known by that name, but by the name of the landholder's franchise. We have broadened the basis, until not only the sons, but the grand-sons and owners, shall have the right to vote; in other words, we intend putting a premium on mothers-in-law in this country. But we propose to give a vote, also, to the sons of those who are tenants. Hitherto the franchise has been confined to the sons of farmers who owned the land. By this Bill we propose to give to the son of a farmer, even though his father is not the owner of the land, provided the father is occupying a separate dwelling. In all the municipalities, the franchise will be of the same character. That is to say, that the son, grandson, or the son-in-law, or any man who is assessed for \$400 in cities or towns, or \$200 in incorporated villages, will be entitled to vote with him on that property. Hon. gentlemen will see that this is a very extensive addition to the franchise, because hitherto a farmer's son could only vote provided he appeared as joint owner. In other words he could not vote unless the farm was assessed for \$400, and then only one son could vote. Two sons could vote on a farm assessed for \$600, three on a farm assessed for \$800, and a farm had to be assessed for \$1,000 to allow four to vote. This Bill will extend to every son of every father, who either owns, or who occupies land as a tenant, because it will be difficult to find any man who is not assessed for \$200 upon his farm, and it will be equally difficult to find any respectable family occupying a house which is not assessed for \$100 in villages, and \$200 in cities and towns."

It appears to me, in comparing this Act with the one now before the House, that there are a vast number of persons who will be disfranchised by this measure. During the greater portion of my life I have been connected with the laboring class; and I have employed, and have to-day in my employ, a large number of laboring men; and, after looking into the matter carefully, I can say that not more than one-fifth of those men will be enfranchised under this Bill, while they will all be enfranchised under the Act passed last Session in the Province of Ontario. We feel