

votes, but it would give two votes. In such a case the elder son took the vote, although he might be the inferior in intellect to the younger. In this respect the measure was not favourable to farmers' sons generally, but only to particular sons. A man who owned a farm of 200 acres, worth \$20,000, and having but one son, would have two votes only, while a man owning fifty acres, worth \$1,000, and having four sons, would have five votes.

Mr. CROOKS raised a question of order. He said that the House had already ordered that this Bill be read a third time to-day. The only amendment permissible would be one relating to the time. It was open to move the six months' delay, or to vote down the third reading, but not an amendment which was opposed to the Bill altogether.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simco) was not aware whether the hon. gentleman had been in the House at the second reading of the Bill, when it was distinctly understood that the right of the Opposition to take exception to the Bill on the second reading would be preserved intact for the third reading. He instanced a recent case in England where such an amendment as that of Mr. Cameron was in order.

Mr. SPEAKER said that he had no doubt that an amendment declaratory of some principle adverse to the Bill might be moved at the second reading or the third reading, or at any other stage of the Bill. He quoted from May a passage showing that an amendment could be moved at this stage adverse to the further progress of the Bill. The amendment was therefore in order.

Mr. CAMERON said the resolution was not prepared in that way without considering it likely that objections might be taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, and it was put advisedly in the shape in which it now was. He proceeded to say that it would be obviously unjust to give a man owning a small property a larger number of votes and greater influence than a man owning a larger property. He was not one of those who thought that property should give a plurality of votes, but he thought the small holder of property ought not to have any advantage over the large holder of property, and this Bill would have that effect, and would therefore be injurious. Another bad effect of the Bill was that it gave farmers' sons a privilege that other classes of the community did not possess. He would like to know why the mechanic resident in Toronto, and possessed of property assessed at \$2,000 and having five sons, should not have his five sons enfranchised as well as the sons of the farmer who was assessed for less? And why not give votes to the sons of the merchant, and the labourer, doctor, and lawyer, who were assessed? To give a vote to a class without attaching a property qualification as owned by the parties themselves, was a step in the direction of manhood suffrage or universal suffrage which he trusted they would not see in this country, for it was not in accordance with the genius of our Constitution, and experience of it in other countries had not given Canada any reason to think it would be beneficial, but, on the contrary, that it would be detrimental and injurious to this country. For these reasons he was opposed to the measure of the hon. Commissioner of Public Works, introduced by the Government simply because they said there was a very small voting interest on income in the rural municipalities and they had given the income franchise to cities, towns, and villages. To this he would reply that the income franchise extended to all parts of the country, and to every class, and it could not therefore be considered class legislation. The Bill conveyed a denial of right to a large portion of the community, because, although every man might be a farmer, every man could not be a farmer's son. He fancied that the Government in introducing this measure felt that they would do something to ingratiate themselves with the farming community. It might be found, however, that those in the country regarded the alleged benefits of the Bill as hurtful to them, especially when the farmer understood that it gave his sons a right to be registered, and record these votes against his own. He would naturally object to his property giving his sons a right to record votes in favour, perhaps, of his political opponents. (Applause.)

Mr. MASSIE said that the hon. gentleman had brought forward a very lame series of objections to the Bill, one of which was that there was an injustice done to the man who happened to be

wealthy and had only one son by his neighbour who was poor and had four or five sons getting votes for each of them. He was not doing the same amount of good to his country.

Mr. BOULTER—Might he not have a number of daughters? (Laughter.)

Mr. MASSIE—He was not doing the same amount of good, and therefore it could be no excuse urged against the Bill. Merchants and mechanics' sons were very easily provided with votes, and besides, they can vote on income. The other reasons were also so lame that he did not think they called for any remarks.

Mr. BARR said that though he represented a farming community, he thought they were not in favour of this Bill, which, besides being a step towards manhood suffrage, was class legislation. He thought that the Bill would be doing an injustice to mechanics who might be paying large sums in taxation, and whose sons would not on that account get a vote, while a farmer of 50 acres with a number of sons would have a vote for each of them. It was a most dangerous step in the wrong direction, and one to be avoided most carefully. After contrasting the relative positions of the rich and poor farmers, he went on to say that in many cases the farmer would have an objection to split his vote on his property, and this measure left him no option. The sons might thus kill the vote of their fathers. Why, if the sons were to have this power, not extend it to the daughters who occupied a similar position?

Mr. ROSEVEAR said he was a farmer, and a staunch believer in Mr. Cameron, to go against whom would be like cutting him to the bone; but on this question he thought his views were wrong. He entered into a defence of the position of the farmers, who were the bone and sinew of the country, and was perfectly satisfied that the measure would not be attended with such results as some hon. members anticipated. He was perfectly satisfied that there will be no coercion of son by father or father by son, and mentioned an instance occurring during his own canvass in support of his views. He concluded by saying that unquestionably the Bill was in the right direction, and he only regretted that it did not include the sons of other classes of the community.

Mr. DEACON said he was opposed to the measure as devoid of common-sense or reason. Because the father voted on a property was no reason why his son should. Such a view was entirely opposed to every principle upon which we have hitherto granted the franchise. The Bill actually proposed to give a vote to one with no interest in the country and with no qualification as a basis. Any one who travels through the country will find that the son does not always vote with the father, and this measure he was sure would produce great ill-will and heart-burnings between father and son. To sum up the matter, it was a bid for the farmers' vote and nothing else, being rotten in principle, unsound in judgment, and with nothing to commend it.

Mr. BETHUNE, though he had not moved much through the rural districts, said that his constituents were, at all events, in favour of the Bill, and considered it in the right direction. He said it was common to find the father as owner and the son as tenant, and it was also common to find the father as owner and tenant. The sons of both, he contended, had an equal right, and was it proper to keep the sons of the latter in that position? He referred to the unseemly displays of swearing so often witnessed in voters' courts. This measure, he thought, was calculated to attach farmers' sons to the soil and let them feel that they are not in a worse position than mechanics in the city. He referred to the important part that the farming community formed in the social economy of the country, and spoke of the desire evinced by so many farmers' sons to leave the old place because they could have no voice in the affairs of the country so long as they remained there. The Bill, to his mind, would have a most powerful effect in this direction. There was always a desire to discuss politics between father and son, but he could not see that it would be likely to lead to rupture when they had the protection of the ballot in voting. They were entitled to it as a right—earning as they did as much, though not in the same way, as those in cities, who enjoyed this privilege—in many cases supporting by their exertions their aged parents, and being, as they are, an intelligent portion of the community, why refuse them?

Mr. RICHARDSON could not agree with