

the hon. member for Stormont in some things. Anyone representing rural districts would know that the Bill was in bad shape. As things were just now one-half of those farmers' sons who did vote were not entitled to vote—the father having in many instances made no transference of interest. In reality, every farmer's son could have this privilege if the father wished it. He was sorry that the right sought to be conferred by this Bill was not extended to other men's sons. Seeing that we could not do better at present, he was going to vote for the Bill.

Mr. DEROCHE said that the last speaker's remarks should have a powerful effect in passing the Bill. Farmers' sons interests were bound up in the farm, and this was an act of justice sought to be done to that very large class to which they belong. From the voters' lists of his Riding he can only find a few voting through the provisions of the income franchise. He thought that this Bill would be placing power and votes in the hands of those who could and would honestly exercise them. He thought the measure would meet with general approval. If it was—and it was—a bid for the farmers' vote, what of it? As long as the farmers were right the country would be right.

Mr. BRODER said that in England either party had always moved very cautiously in extending the franchise. Though this matter had been repeatedly referred to in the Speech from the Throne it had not been approached in such a precipitate manner as that in which the Commissioner of Public Works had proceeded, who had only given one reason for his introducing the Bill—that it would alleviate or do away with much questionable swearing. This was no reason why we should now legalize this. He said unless we would give manhood suffrage we should not authorize this measure. A power once given to the people can never be recalled. He objected to the measure as class legislation. He did not fancy that the power proposed to be conferred on farmers' sons would be abused. The sons have no direct interest in the soil, and we might as well grant every subject twenty acres of waste land, and thus a vote. He was not prepared to give manhood suffrage. He thought that such an agitation for such a right should have come from the country, and not emanated from the Government. The farming community should hurl back such a Bill, granted to them on such a plea as that urged by the introducer of this measure. He said that this Bill virtually stamped one class of the sons of the fathers of the community with inferiority. The member for Stormont thought that this measure would tie the farmers' sons to the soil, an idea which he considered absurd, as it was found that it was the most clever and energetic sons who left home first. A father was the best judge as to which son was best entitled to a vote, which he had the means of giving him. The fact of the farmers being the most numerous portion of the community was all the more reason why the minority should not be slighted. A man's calling being a matter of choice, he should have the same privileges whatever pursuit he followed. How is the clerk in making out his voters' list from the statute labour list to distinguish the *bona fide* occupants from the fancy ones sought to be created? He was opposed to the Bill as interfering with the right of property and putting the control of the property into the sons' hands, and would therefore vote for the amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR said this measure was well known not to be an experiment. It was only a Bill to legalize what is now done in an unscrupulous manner or sometimes at the risk of rather hard swearing. He approved of the Bill in the right direction, and did not think that the sons of mechanics would feel injured at the privilege sought to be conferred upon the farmers' sons, as they occupied a different position from the sons of any other members of the community, being to all intents farm owners except in name.

Mr. GRANT briefly concurred in the object of the Bill.

Mr. ROBINSON said that the farmers of his district were all in favour of this measure. He himself, however, considered that it was only a step in the right direction, as he preferred Mr. Currie's Bill. He did not see why any man, so long as he conducted himself properly, should not have a vote.

Mr. PAXTON supported the Bill, and thought the farmers were entitled to it. It was well known that the farmers had not the influence in the country to which their

wealth and intelligence entitled them. He and gentlemen opposite talked of giving protection to the farmers when they were making speeches in the country, but the moment it was proposed in this House to give the farmers an advantage gentlemen opposite raised their voices against the proposal. The farming community would judge by this how hollow were the professions of the Conservatives, and that they talked about protection to the farmers merely for a purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM considered that the principles of the Bill were correct.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE considered that universal suffrage was the only solution of the franchise difficulties. He believed, therefore, that the Bill was a step in the right direction, seeing that he advocated giving votes to every person over 21 years of age. He denied the assertion that had been made that the sons of other classes of the community were not as honest as the sons of farmers. If the Government were consistent they should go a step further and give universal suffrage.

Mr. HARKIN objected to the Bill because it interfered with private rights by compelling a farmer to give his sons a vote, whether he liked it or not. He fancied the farmers would dislike the compulsion.

Mr. GIBSON believed that the farmer had no objections to giving his sons the franchise whether they voted with him or not.

Mr. BELL thought the effect of the Bill would be to promote strife in families. Farmers would scarcely care for being overruled in votes and influence by their own sons, on no other qualification than that derived from themselves. The action of the Bill should have been permissive rather than compulsory. He failed to see why the sons of farmers should be singled out for the franchise over the sons of other men. Had the sons of farmers better opportunities of forming a correct judgment of the political state of the country than people resident in cities and towns?

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) strongly supported the Bill.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) continued his speech, and contended that the reason why the gentlemen of the Opposition did not like the Bill was that they already have for some time enjoyed the benefits sought to be conferred by this Act through manufacturing votes. He said we ought to look at this as part of a great plan for the development of man and womanhood.

Mr. SCOTT thought that this question should receive discussion not on political grounds, thought its effect would no doubt be very much in favour of the members of the Government as it now is. Judging the Bill on its merits he could not support it. He thought it conferring manhood suffrage upon a certain favoured portion of the community. They are to be placed simply on the assessment roll as a stepping stone to being placed on the voters' lists, and the estate of the father will be taxed in the future as it has been in the past. It not only seeks this, but seeks to apply them in an extreme degree. No advocates of manhood suffrage hitherto has held that it should be conferred on anyone merely as attaining his majority. Advocates of manhood suffrage, though not agreeing in many things, have in this: that 21 years is too young to confer the vote, the receiver being then not thoroughly emancipated from parental authority. Manhood suffrage, he admitted, was a question calling for much consideration, and upon which much could be said. No doubt we would, and perhaps at no very distant date, when education and intelligence, which are after all the true qualifications for a voter, have extended, be called upon to discuss the question. Were this Bill carried it would have one of two effects in the immediate future—either the repeal of the measure or its extension without distinction as to the occupation or calling of the parent. He quoted Mr. Hare upon such a question as that now before them. One thing he wanted to know: Have the farming community asked for this Bill? He thought the farming community did not desire it. The foundation of the Bill seems to premise that those whom it proposes to enfranchise will not be able to acquire the necessary qualification, but this he thought was a presumption that would not commend itself to the farming community, which, if he understood it properly, would rather cast its lot with the other classes of the people and have a