

organ strongly opposed the farmer's son franchise, it was not favorable to enfranchising any others. I shall show that when we proposed giving a franchise to mechanics' sons they opposed it in the most bitter terms. Now, we find that the Conservative party in the House advocated the suffrage being given to mechanics' and merchants' sons, and the organ delivered itself in this style :

"On what principle, either in the 'British stake in the country' theory or the Democratic idea of human brotherhood and equality, are the merchants, mechanics and others to be regarded as specially entitled to vote? Only in exceptional cases is the young man whose father happens to be a merchant, tradesman, mechanic or professional man a virtual though not finally acknowledged partner in his parent's business, keeping it up for the common benefit of the family, and while there are, doubtless, good reasons for extending the franchise to include many of the young men in cities and towns at present debarred from it, the proposition to make the sons of merchants, mechanics and others a privileged caste, and to endow them with the suffrage by reason of their fathers' vocation, is altogether too absurd and untenable."

Mr. Meredith in January 1883 moved this resolution :

"That this House is of opinion that justice to large and important portions of the community demands a liberal extension of the franchise, particularly in the direction of conferring on the sons of mechanics, and others not now entrusted with the franchise, the same privileges as are now conferred on farmers' sons."

One would suppose that this being a very liberal measure it would have been received with favor by Mr. Mowat. But instead of replying to it himself, he put up Mr. Cascaden, M. P. for West Elgin. He said :

"It was, however, a question in which they should hasten slowly, for once it was extended they could not recede—they could not contract it—however evidently desirable it might be."

So you see that so far as the franchise was concerned, the Reformers steadily opposed it. Recollect, too, that was in the face of a resolution of the Reform convention of January, 1883, which declared that there should be a liberal extension of the franchise, and that the people should be consulted upon it. Upon that occasion a number of persons, though not the leading members of the party, discussed the question of the franchise, and two minor members of the party moved and seconded a resolution to this effect :

"That this convention rejoices in the successful operation of these extensions of the franchise, which have from time to time been placed on the Statute Book, records its opinion that a further extension should form a plank in the platform of the Reform Party at the ensuing elections, and expresses its hopes that the popular voice will endorse the proposal and will return a liberal majority, authorized to accomplish this reform."

We see that Mr. Mowat refused to extend the franchise up to that time. In January, 1883, Mr. Meredith moved again to strike out the clause imposing a tax upon income. That was voted down. He moved another motion, to reduce the income franchise from \$400 to \$300. That was also voted down. But Mr. Mowat, finding that he was acting against the will of the people, knowing that the desire was that the franchise should be extended, on the following day had the following resolution moved by Mr. Fraser :—

"That the Liberal party of this Province stands pledged to extend the franchise; that if this House should now legislate to extend the franchise, any law passed for that purpose could not be brought into operation in time for the coming general election; that any considerable extension of the franchise is especially a subject upon which the people ought to be consulted; that the approaching general election will afford an opportunity for so consulting and ascertaining the wishes of the people; but the House, mean while, does not hesitate to affirm its opinion that no such extension of the franchise will prove satisfactory which does not, with proper checks and safeguards, give the right to vote to all classes who can fairly and reasonably claim to be endowed therewith."

That was carried, because he felt that public opinion was with the motion of Mr. Meredith, and although he had voted that motion down, he was compelled to put up Mr. Fraser to move the motion I have read. During the elections of 1883, only once did Mr. Mowat speak about the franchise. When attending a meeting in West Toronto, he said he had no decided views on the subject; Mr. Meredith was able to say specifically what he had to propose;

but he, Mr. Mowat, did not choose to take that position. So up to the general elections, Mr. Mowat had no idea of extending the franchise. Then we find that the Dominion Parliament met upon the 17th January, 1884; the Franchise Bill was promised by the Government in a Speech from the Throne, and the *Globe* on the 18th January, said :

"It is promised that the Franchise Bill of last Session will be again introduced."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I rise to a point of Order. There is no desire on this side to prevent the hon. gentleman from reading; but I remember that, only the other day, the hon. gentleman quoted parliamentary authorities with a great deal of zeal to prevent an hon. member from reading an extract. During the three-quarters of an hour the hon. gentleman has already spoken, not more than five minutes have been occupied by expressing his own sentiments. I am pleased to hear the extracts; I only wish to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to this point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have not seen the hon. gentleman reading his speech. I noticed that he read one or two extracts.

Mr. RYKERT. The only difference is that I exercised discretion. I know that discretion is not possible with hon. gentlemen opposite. I read from an authority which laid down that, when members read extracts, discretion must be used. I have felt that I can use discretion, and that while quotations of three or four lines are in order, extracts are not in order when they reach three or four chapters. That rule you applied, Mr. Chairman, the other day, when an hon. member was reading eight or ten pages on female suffrage. I, however, have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite do not like to hear these extracts read.

Mr. PATERSON. I do.

Mr. RYKERT. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not like to be brought face to face with the records of their party. There is not any position taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite but we can confront them with their speeches made on former occasions. When the great tariff question was under discussion in Parliament in 1879, we cited the opinions and speeches of the members for North Norfolk and South Brant to prove that we were justified in adopting the National Policy, and quoted their speeches of 1876 in answer to their argument in opposition thereto. We showed by their speeches that they had turned political somersaults. In fact, whenever they advance any arguments on any question in this House, all we have to do is to turn up former speeches in Parliament to answer them.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the hon. gentleman's own remark, not an extract.

Mr. RYKERT. When interrupted I was quoting an authority which will be recognised. On the 24th January, 1884, the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, forced by the leader of this Government, who had declared, upon the 17th January, that he would introduce a Franchise Bill, announced in the Speech from the Throne the extension of the franchise. The words were :

"In this connexion I invite your attention to the expediency of further extending the already liberal Franchise which prevails in this Province."

Upon that occasion neither the mover nor the seconder of the Address spoke a word in favor of that clause, in fact it was entirely ignored; and even the *Globe*, which anticipated the Speech, said nothing about the franchise. Notwithstanding the promises made in the speech, the Session of 1884 passed, without the Ontario Government introducing any Bill increasing the franchise in accordance with the promises made before the elections. Then we came down to 1885, the present Session. This Parliament met on the 29th January, and the Speech from the Throne promised an extension of the franchise. The Ontario Government find-