

assessed between \$300 and \$400, and only twenty-six persons between \$200 and \$300, who will be entitled to vote. The only gain under the Mowat Bill in the city of St. Catharines, with its population of 10,000, will be twenty-six. This Bill also recognises the principle recognised years ago in the old Parliament of Canada, of what is called "tenancy franchise." Although some objection has been taken to some of the details of that section, the principle of tenant franchise is fully recognised. In Mr. Mowat's Bill a man must have property worth a certain amount, but in the present Bill a person representing a piece of property, no matter how small or how large, if he pays \$2 a month, can have a vote. I would like to know where there is a tenant who pays less than \$2 a month? We come now to the income franchise. In the Province of Ontario there is a large number of persons with salaries of \$400, who, at the present time, claim exemption and will not be assessed. They do not appear upon the voters' lists because they are not assessed, and the courts have determined that no man can be placed upon the list after the assessment roll is revised, for income, unless he is assessed. So that, in the Province of Ontario, a man must be assessed for \$400 before he can have a vote. Under this Bill a man need not be assessed for anything, he has only to have an income of \$400, so there is the advantage under this Bill. In the Province of Ontario he must pay taxes and be placed upon the assessment roll, so that in these two respects this Bill is far better than the other. I have been struck with the fact, during this discussion, that some hon. gentlemen, particularly the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), have exhibited a great deal of anxiety for Nova Scotia, and have pointed out that this Bill is going to disfranchise large numbers in that Province. Well, I find that on the 7th May, 1885, the *Halifax Chronicle*, a good Grit organ, as I understand, denounced the Franchise Bill in almost as strong terms as the hon. gentlemen in this House. That paper says this:

"The difference between the proposed franchise and those now in operation are more in name than in reality. Very few of the young men who would be entitled to vote under the Dominion Act as having an income of \$300 a year, would not possess \$300 personal property entitling them to vote in this Province. We believe the two lists which we require to be made up, if the Dominion Bill becomes law, will, if fairly made up, be nearly identical."

I quote that as an answer to those hon. gentlemen who say this Bill is going to work great injustice in Nova Scotia. Now, the principal difference between this Bill and the Local Bill of Ontario is this: In the Local Legislature the assessment rolls are the guide, and every one knows that in townships particularly, men are assessed as low as possible, and still have the right to vote, in order to evade the taxation imposed by the county council. Hon. gentlemen who know anything about municipal affairs in Ontario, know that the rolls are equalised by the county council, and therefore in rural municipalities and towns not separated from the county, property is assessed as low as possible in order that the owners may reduce the county taxation. But in this Bill the revising barrister, or the judge, takes the actual value of the property; he does not take the assessed value at all, so that where the assessed value is \$100 in the municipality, the actual value might be \$250, and in cities where the value is assessed at \$200, the actual value may be \$400. In this Bill the revising barrister states the actual value, irrespective of the assessed value, the voter under this law not being liable to pay any taxes. Now I have briefly pointed out the inconsistencies of hon. gentlemen in opposing this Bill. I think they have manifested a disposition to obstruct legislation in reference to this Bill. Anyone who will examine the *Hansard* will see that these hon. gentlemen have occupied something like 400 or 500 pages in the discussion of a measure that might have been discussed in 15 pages; and they have done so,

Mr. RYKERT.

not for the purpose of defending provincial rights, but with a view of obstructing this Bill so that the Government will be forced to withdraw it. The First Minister has declared that this Bill shall become law this present Session, and his supporters believe he is right. The House has affirmed the principle on the second reading by a large majority, and we would be false to our trust, and to the position we occupy as representatives of the people, if we were to allow the Opposition, simply because we might be inconvenienced by sitting here three or four months, to obstruct the Bill and prevent the legislation being carried through. Mr. Chairman, I support this Bill because I believe that we ought to have a uniform franchise that cannot be interfered with or altered by the Local Legislatures. As I have pointed out, the Local Legislature of Ontario has unjustly and unfairly disfranchised thousands of people who have heretofore enjoyed the privilege of the franchise and who voted for us in 1882, who when we go back for re-election will have no right to pass judgment on our action. For example, non-resident voters at the last election will have no right to pass judgment on our actions because they are disfranchised, and judgment will be passed upon us by a different set of men. That is not a just course to pursue. We have no guarantee that the franchise will not be altered by Mr. Mowat before the next general election; that there will not be compulsory voting, that woman suffrage will not be granted, that manhood suffrage will not be granted. Knowing all these facts, and what are the views of members of this House on these three important questions, manhood suffrage, woman suffrage and compulsory voting, and having strong views on these questions, are we to place ourselves in the hands of politicians like Oliver Mowat, who has shown his determination to fight against the interests of the Dominion? I feel as the leader of the Opposition felt in 1871, that there should be no entangling alliance between Ontario and the Dominion. The hon. member for West Durham, when leader of the Opposition in the Local House in 1871, said:

"As citizens of Ontario we are called upon to frame our own policy with reference to our Provincial rights and interests and to conduct our own affairs; and we deprecate, nay more, we protest most strongly against any interference on the part of any Government with our perfect freedom of action."

Again said Mr. Blake:

"Their position was this, that the Local Government should be perfectly independent of the Central Government and should neither be entangled by alliance nor embarrassed by hostility."

Those are true and sound principles. If they are adhered to, then I say that the Local Legislature of Ontario will occupy its true position. I am in favor of an entirely different franchise for the Provincial as compared with Dominion elections. We are sent here to advocate measures entirely different to those coming before the Local Legislature. When we have narrow-minded men who hold that local matters are paramount, when a Local Legislature arraigns itself as the Ontario Legislature has done against the interests of the Dominion, we have a right to fortify ourselves and protect ourselves, and take care not to place ourselves in the hands of such politicians as at the present time control the Legislature of Ontario.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not rise to engage in further discussion as to the amendment I placed in your hands some days ago and which is still before the House. I rise for the purpose of referring to one or two points made by the Premier, when you, Mr. Chairman, first took the Chair this afternoon. We have great satisfaction in the declaration made by that hon. gentleman that he has resisted the demands of his followers, that the cloture should be applied.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. I said nothing about my followers. I said that demands had been made from various sources.