

more emphatic condemnation of this Bill? Yet they call this elevating the Indian to a position of citizenship, and giving him equal rights and privileges with the rest of the electorate of this Dominion.

Mr. HESSON. Give us something fresh. We have had that already four times from you.

Mr. BAIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite will need to hear it four times more before they can understand it. If my hon. friend will get up and say this is placing the Indian in a position of citizenship, the same as he and I occupy, then I will abandon any attempt to make him understand this question. But he knows right well, and the leader of the Government knows right well, that the Indian's hands will be tied, and they do not expect that he will exercise the Franchise freely and independently. Sir, if intelligence should regulate the adjustment of the franchise I would ask the leader of the Government how it was that he so readily abandoned the principle of giving the franchise to women who represent property, and who show that they have the intelligence to take care of it, while he is yet so tenacious of giving the Indian a vote, when he dare not trust him with control of his own property? Is not that a proof that on this occasion intelligence does not count, and that something else made the right hon. gentleman so tenacious of the Indian vote and so easy to abandon woman suffrage. There is another feature in this Bill which shows that, after all, it does not secure a uniformity of franchise in this Dominion. I refer to Prince Edward Island, and while the hon. gentleman declined to give it the concession that its members asked for, he hoped yet to broaden out the Bill so as to qualify nearly all the people there who now exercise the suffrage. Now, Sir, I think that if the members of some of the other Provinces would speak out honestly they would rise up and object to having what, in former years, has been the parliamentary qualification of the Province of Ontario obtruded upon their Province, just as our friends from Prince Edward Island have objected to the franchise of the other Provinces being imposed upon their Province. One of the hon. members for King's, P. E. I., has shown his independence by placing an amendment in your hands that proposes to retain manhood suffrage. The provision he proposes to insert would certainly be unique if it was placed in the Bill providing for a uniform franchise in this Dominion. It is nothing less than this, that in that clause which recites the qualification in cities and towns for the various electoral districts in this Dominion, after the words "every person shall," and then the definition follows, he proposes to insert "except in the Province of Prince Edward Island." Now, if this Bill had met their approbation would these gentlemen have asked that that particular clause should be inserted in it? I confess that I felt a little amused at the report that *Hansard* has given of the hon. gentleman's remarks on moving this amendment. He is reported as saying that it was absurd to think that the various Legislatures should have power to fix the franchise of the various electoral divisions that elect representatives to this House; and he went on to say that in their island they had had manhood suffrage for twenty-five or thirty years, both with respect to the Local Legislature and with respect to this House, and that it had worked well. Yet, while in one breath he said it was absurd that the Provinces should fix the qualification for the election of members to this House, in the very next breath he says: We have a qualification different from what is proposed to be established for members of this House, and which, if he carries his amendment, will be retained, and he tells us it has worked admirably in his Province. I say there is no gentleman in this House, if he spoke the honest sentiments of his heart, who would not get up and re-echo the statement that the provincial franchises in the various

Mr. BAIN.

Provinces had worked satisfactorily, both as respects the election of members for the Provincial Legislatures and as respects the election of members for the House of Commons. I venture to prophesy that if the Government refuse, and the leader of the Government has indicated that he will refuse, to concede to Prince Edward Island the right to have its own franchise, we shall not find the mover of the amendment to the amendment continuing his opposition to the Government Bill. He will quietly accept the situation and support the Government, although they have perpetrated this gross outrage upon the Province. It must be remembered that values vary in the different Provinces, and that \$300 will not represent the same voting power in the Maritime Provinces as in British Columbia or the North-West, so there will not be uniformity. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) had a peculiar dread of the Ontario Legislature and seems to imagine that nothing should be allowed in their charge. He undertook to tell the House that the Opposition wished the Ontario franchise to be imposed on the rest of the Dominion. But if the leader of the Government copied his Franchise Bill from any Province he copied the cast-off franchise of the Province of Ontario, which he now proposes to use as a mould in which all the rest of the Dominion is to be run. We, on this side of the House, do not propose to impose the Ontario franchise on the other Provinces at all. But we say that in all the Provinces they should pursue the same course which they have pursued satisfactorily for the life-time of this Confederation—leave the various Provinces to work out their own local destinies and regulate their own franchises as they see fit. The leader of the House is not only attempting to impose the franchise of one Province on the rest, but he is attempting to resist the steps in advance which have been taken by the Province of Ontario in the matter of the franchise. His own friends in Ontario, represented by Mr. Meredith and his followers, are ultra-Liberals in this matter. They do not, like this Government, propose to exclude all the wage earners of the people below \$400 income from the right to have a vote. I remember when hon. gentlemen were extremely soliticious about the wage-earners and the workmen of the Dominion. But, when it comes to the question of who shall control the destinies of the country, we find them going back to the old proposition that no man with an income of less than \$400 a year should be entitled to a vote, a provision which has been left far behind by the Legislature of Ontario. I wish to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if they are true to the traditions and associations of their own political party in Ontario they will step out further in this matter of the franchise, as Mr. Meredith and his followers have declared themselves in favor of manhood suffrage, as applied to provincial legislation. I say, if there is one case more than another where manhood suffrage should be applied it is not in the case of the Provinces, where they deal with local rights and the rights of property, and when they have direct taxation, but in the case of this Dominion, where our taxes are indirect, and where every man who wears clothes, consumes groceries, or, for that matter, smokes cigars or drinks liquor, contributes to the taxation. We found that the hon. member for Lincoln, with that modesty which characterises him, said that he did not wish to blow his own trumpet, but that so far back as 1868 he had advocated this income franchise, and that two or three years afterwards he introduced a Bill which the Ontario Government of the day adopted, and it became law. I would point out to him that this Dominion has made immense strides within the past fifteen years, and that the hon. gentleman, perhaps, owing to his associations since that time, has not maintained his progressive instincts, because we find him now supporting a proposition that unless a man earns \$400 a year income he shall not be entitled to vote. It seems to trouble that hon.