

compare that with what Mr. Mowat did of whom hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of talking. We find that Mr. Mowat's Parliament was in Session six weeks before his Bill was introduced. His Parliament met on the 28th of January, and on the 5th of March the Bill was read the first time. It was not printed until the 20th, it was read the second time on the 24th, and passed on the 28th; and this was a Bill more revolutionary in its character than any previous Franchise Bill—a Bill which enfranchised the Indians and extended the franchise almost in every direction. Mr. Mowat went one better than the First Minister. The hon. gentleman was determined to go one better than the First Minister. He saw what the First Minister's Bill was, the same as the previous Session, he sits down, draws his Bill, almost all the clauses drawn in such a way as to go one better than the First Minister. This Bill had been before Parliament and had been discussed before the people as the member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) said. But one member, the hon. member for Brant, admitted that he had never heard of the Bill before. A newspaper man, a man who knows so much of what is going on in the country, says he knew nothing about the Bill. That shows what reliance can be placed on this gentleman who cannot keep a faithful record of the affairs of the country. Hon. gentlemen say the Bill is going to be too expensive. Although that is somewhat out of the record, I will simply say that the estimates made by hon. gentlemen in regard to that are something like their estimates a few years ago in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. One hon. gentleman said it would cost \$500,000. Another said it would cost \$715,000. When the question of the revising barrister is under discussion, I shall take the liberty to give my view of what the cost really is, but I repeat what I said before, that the cost in the first year of the revising barrister and his clerk and his constable will not be as much as what hon. gentlemen have cost the country by the unreasonable obstruction which they have exhibited in regard to this Bill, nor as much as it has cost to publish all the absurd returns which they have asked for—some 700 or 800. These gentlemen are never at home unless they are reckless in assertion. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) stated a few nights ago that, if this Bill passed, there would be 150,000 men disfranchised in the Province of Ontario, and in order to show that, he went into an estimate. The member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) went 25,000 better. The next night he said there would be 150,000 disfranchised. Let us come to the record. It may surprise the hon. gentlemen when I tell them the results from the official documents, but I want to show how reckless these gentlemen are in their random statements, how regardless they are of the facts, how economical of the truth, in fact, they kick it around in every direction. According to the last official return, there were in the Province of Ontario only 472,411 persons of the age of twenty-one years and upwards. Let us turn to the record of the Ontario Government, and see how many persons are enfranchised to-day in that Province without Mr. Mowat's new Bill, because, mark you, that is not now the law of the land, it does not come into operation till next January. According to the law in force to-day in the Province of Ontario, the franchise is \$400 in cities, \$300 in towns, \$200 in townships and villages, and \$400 income. The total number of persons enfranchised under that law to-day, is 417,112, so that there are only 55,309 persons in the Province of Ontario above twenty-one years of age who had not the franchise, including lunatics, criminals, insane, deaf, dumb and blind. Yet the hon. gentleman says this Bill will disfranchise 125,000 people. How is it going to do that? The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) will say: Oh, but some of you vote twice. On his own estimate, according to his first statement, there were 15,000 who voted twice. Subsequently, he said there were 7,500. I will take his

statement of 15,000, and, adding that to the 55,309, we have 70,309 against 150,000 or 125,000, the number given by the member for West Elgin and the member for West Huron respectively, and this is assuming that not one additional person will be enfranchised under this Act. You see how reckless they are. There are not, from the age of 21 years up to 99 years, more than 55,309 who have not votes to-day in the Province of Ontario, and of the voters 286,000 voted in 1883, at the last general election, and the votes unpolled were 120,153. When they deliberately told the House and the country that 150,000 men will be disfranchised by this Bill, they were talking what they know is not correct, they were making random and reckless statements for political purposes, for the purpose of casting some obloquy and some disgrace upon the First Minister, and getting the people to stir up meetings and arouse a feeling in the country against the Bill. I assert that not a gentleman on that side of the House can point to a single person in the Province of Ontario, who, to-day, has a vote who will be disfranchised by this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear. Not one.

Mr. RYKERT. When we go back to render an account of our stewardship, there will not be one who had a vote for us before who will not have a vote on that occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And a great many more.

Mr. RYKERT. And a great many more, as I shall show presently. These gentlemen must have a little shame when they look at the record they have made in this House. In analysing this Bill I take my own constituency. I have taken the trouble since last Friday to have all the assessment rolls of my constituency sent to this House, in order to see the effect of this Bill and of Mr. Mowat's Bill on my county. In the first place, Mr. Mowat's Bill will deprive of their votes 269 non-resident freehold voters, who have exercised the franchise for twenty-five or thirty years. I myself have voted in the county of Welland for nearly thirty years, and I am cut off from that; but, while they adopt that principle, viz., that non-residents shall not vote as far as parliamentary elections are concerned, in municipal elections it is different. I voted ten times in one day in ten different places. That shows that, while they are willing to allow that for municipal purposes, they are not willing to allow it for parliamentary purposes. I should like to know why I should have the privilege of voting in the city of St. Catharines in six wards for eighteen aldermen, and in the township of Grantham for four councillors and a reeve, and in the township of Niagara in my own county, and in the village of Merriton, and yet, when it comes to a parliamentary election, where my responsibilities are greater than in municipal affairs, I can only vote where I live, and not where I have the largest amount of property. There are in my own county 269 people disfranchised by reason of being non-resident. Taking Mr. Mowat's Bill, there are in that county of Lincoln, outside of the city of St. Catharines, only 49 persons who are assessed for an amount under \$200. To-day there are only 49 persons who will gain the franchise by Mr. Mowat's Bill. I am assuming that they are only assessed for \$100, but they are assessed under \$200, so that while I lose 269 of non-residents, I gain 49 as voters having \$100 and upwards. Now, we will take the city of St. Catharines, this shows the fact that every person assessed for property in the Province of Ontario—unless, as the leader of the Opposition says, he lives in a God-forsaken part of the country—is assessed for \$200. There is hardly anyone living with a roof over his head at all, who is not worth \$200. Hon. gentlemen know, in canvassing the country, that every elector tries to be assessed for an amount sufficient to give him a vote. Now, take the city of St. Catharines, with a franchise of \$400. I find there are only twenty-nine persons