

Mr. WHITE—The gaol records.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Would you not have any machinery for getting at the gaol records? It would require machinery for registration, and yet the hon. gentleman proposes to change the whole basis upon which the voting of the country has been placed—namely, the assessment roll—and have for it the register substituted. He proposes that the executive for the time being shall control the whole system of registration.

Mr. MEREDITH—No, no.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—I suppose the hon. gentleman would put the control somewhere, and if he follows the

#### LEAD OF HIS CHIEF

at Ottawa he would place it in the hands of the executive for the time being. Surely if the executive at Ottawa is fit to have the control of the registration of the country, then the executive of Ontario is equally fit to have the control of the registration of this Province. I say it is an improper thing that the executive should have control of the registration without regard to whether this Government is in power or any other. No executive should have the power to appoint the registrars, and yet there certainly would be required some machinery to carry out the provisions of the Act. Now the hon. gentleman complains that there are some provisions in this Bill which the people cannot understand, but I must say that there are clauses in the Bill of his chief at Ottawa that I, as a lawyer, do not understand. The Bill now before the House is one I think that no one should have any great difficulty in arriving at a knowledge of their meaning. This Bill is altogether based on the same lines that Franchise Bills have always been based on in this Province, namely, the assessment rolls, and it is just as simple—**every line and every word, as the Act now on the statute book.** I therefore give my unqualified denial to the assertion or insinuation that there will be the slightest difficulty in carrying out the provisions of this Bill. There is only one difficulty in the matter at all, and that is with regard to the wage-earner, and I don't anticipate any serious trouble even in that direction. Now the hon. gentleman with all his ingenuity can only suggest that there may be some schoolmaster in this country who is not getting \$300 a year, and who consequently will not be entitled to vote. Where is this schoolmaster who is not earning \$300 a year? I venture to say that if he is not actually receiving \$300 a year in cash he is receiving something in lieu of it and equal to it and therefore I say

#### WITHOUT FEAR OF CONTRADICTION

that every resident schoolmaster of the age of 21 will be entitled to vote under this measure. Then he says some may be sick, and therefore they will not be able to vote. Will I undertake to say that if his manhood suffrage comes into force there will be some sick and then they will not be able to vote. Again he says that there will be some students at the University who will not be able to vote under the proposed safeguards and restrictions, but I may say as I said before that this cannot be for more than one general election, because if the act were to go into force tomorrow—as the students are at the University for about four or five years—they could miss voting at only one general election. I venture the assertion that under this Bill there will be as many people entitled to vote as under any Bill for manhood suffrage which could be devised. Another reason for the passage of the Bill is found in the fact that if the proposal of the hon. gentleman were carried it would not be sufficiently considered in this session to be passed as a Bill, and it would have the effect of preventing the next local election being held under its provisions. He concluded by expressing the confident hope that the Bill would be supported by the House.

Mr. CLARKE (West Toronto) was not afraid to build on the rock of manhood suffrage. He once believed in the property qualification, but he had become a convert to manhood suffrage. He had found in the course of his electioneering that many stupid and ignorant men had the right to exercise the franchise, while many intelligent men were deprived of the franchise on account of the property qualification. The property qualification once did mean something, but as we have had it for the past ten or twelve years it meant nothing. This Bill was a complicated Bill.

Mr. FRASER—It is as simple as can be.

Mr. CLARKE said it was not a simple Bill, and that it left room for graveyard voting. Hon. gentlemen said there would be a difficulty in excluding the criminals under the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. FRASER—I said that machinery would have to be provided.

Mr. CLARKE said that the Bill was a complicated one. A dwelling house was a very general term. In Scotland a man who had a front door had a dwelling house. This Parliament could easily provide all the necessary machinery for registration. The assessors could do all that was necessary. Hon. gentlemen said there would be fraud. He thought there was less danger of fraud under the simpler system proposed in the amendment.

Mr. FERRIS said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) had said there would be danger of personation under the Franchise Bill. He had instanced the personation of voters in Toronto by persons who have property in more than one

ward of the city. The hon. gentleman was libelling the highest class of voters in Toronto. There was no probability that any one who would gain the franchise by this Bill would have more than one vote. He congratulated the leader of the Opposition on the converts on the other side of the House to manhood suffrage. The time was when the honourable gentleman himself stood alone in favour of manhood suffrage. On a later occasion the honourable gentleman coupled the proper qualification with the right of farmers' sons to vote. This was really the first occasion on which the honourable gentleman had stretched himself to such a pitch of liberality. We have now a nearly perfect system of registration. Whatever danger the hon. member for West Toronto had apprehended from personation would be from the large property-holders. From every point of view this Bill was thoroughly liberal, and extended the right to vote to every person who was fit to vote.

A vote was then taken on the amendment, which was lost by 42 to 30. Following is the division list:—

YEAS—Messrs. Baskerville, Blythe, Broder, Carnegie, Clancy, Clarke (Toronto), Creighton, Denison, Fell, French, Gray, Hammell, Hudson, Kerns, Kerr, Lees, McColman, McGhee, McKay, Meredith, Merriek, Metcalfe, Morgan, Morris, Mulholland, Preston, Robillard, Ross (Cornwall), White, Wilmot—30.

NAYS—Messrs. Awrey, Badgerow, Balfour, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Bizard, Cascadeu, Chisholm, Dill, Dryden, Ferris, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gilhes, Gould, Graham, Hagar, Harcourt, Hardy, Hart, Laidlaw, McKim, McMahon, Master, Morin, Mowat, Murray, Neelon, O'Connor, Pardee, Phelps, Rayside, Ross (Huron) Ross, (Middlesex), Sills, Snider, Waters, Widdifield, Young—42.

The motion was then put and carried unanimously.

Hon. C. F. FRASER moved that these words be added to the original motion, "And that it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on said Bill 144, to incorporate and consolidate therewith the several provisions of Bill No. 146 and Bill No. 155, making such changes therein as may be necessary for the purposes of consolidating and incorporating the said Bills." Carried.

The House went into Committee on the Franchise Bill, Mr. FRASER intimating that he wished to get the Bill through the Committee as soon as possible in order to expedite the consolidation of the Bills relating to the franchise.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) moved an amendment providing that members of the active militia, who had been enrolled as such for twelve months previous to the election, should be allowed the right to vote. He hoped that the Commissioner of Public Works if he was not prepared to accept the amendment on the spot, would give it his consideration.

Hon. C. F. FRASER promised to do so, and the amendment was not pressed at this stage.

The Bill was reported with amendments, the Committee rose, and the House adjourned at 12:15 a. m.