

Amendment negatived on the following division :

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Anger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex)	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :  
Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maskingó),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLellan,	Woodworth—87.

Amendments made in Committee of the Whole read the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the said amendments be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to ask the First Minister how he proposes to get a list of the Indian voters. I have pointed out to him, at different times, that they are not in the same position as other voters. The Bill provides that the revising officer shall take the assessment roll, and that where there is no assessment roll, as in Prince Edward Island, he shall take the last list of voters; but the Indians have no assessment roll and no last list of voters. The agent is not permitted to tell who are entitled to vote, and by what means is the list to be made up? It seems to me the First Minister ought to have given the matter some consideration. The Indians occupy an exceptional position altogether, and that is what led me to make the motion I did. But how are the Indian names to be got, and got fairly.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). What will prevent the agent giving the names?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The fact that an Indian is a red man does not prevent his going and having his name put on by himself or by his agent, just the same as a white man. The revising officer will go to a municipality and will hold his little court, and the Indians will themselves call personally or by an agent.

Mr. MILLS. How can an unenfranchised Indian appoint an agent? He has no legal capacity.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FISHER. I spoke a few moments ago to the right hon. leader of the Government about a very slight amendment which I think is necessary in the 18th section of the Bill. It was arranged by that section that anyone objecting to a name on the list should notify the revising officer by a registered letter, and also that the person objecting must notify the person objected to; but it does not say by registered letter, and I simply propose that those words should be added. The right hon. gentleman, in conversation, a few minutes ago, said he was quite willing to accept this amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I mentioned to the hon. gentleman that as those words had been omitted by general consent they could be added at this stage.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS moved :

That the Bill be not now read the third, but that it be read the third time this day three months.

He said: I will make a very few observations on the motion which I have put into your hands. This is a very important measure, and one upon which there is a very wide difference of opinion between hon. gentlemen on that side and those on this side of the House. We regard the measure as less objectionable than it was when it was introduced, but we still think it is a very objectionable measure—one not in the public interest, one not calculated to secure a fair expression of opinion in the country, and one which gives to the Government of the day a power they ought not to possess. In my opinion, the Administration stand before the country as an interested party, precisely the same as do hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; and the policy of the law, hitherto, has been, not to put the preparation of the voters' lists into the hands of either the Ministers or their opponents, but to leave it in the hands of the electorate, those who are the masters of Parliament, with whom the supreme power is vested, and who are to decide by whom the government of the country shall be carried on. Now, this measure, it seems to me, violates that important principle, in putting into the hands of the Government, for the time being, the appointment of those parties by whom the lists are to be prepared. Besides that, there is a very wide departure from what hitherto has been the well recognised rule in introducing and carrying through Parliament an important measure of this kind, without first having had the opinion of the country expressed upon it. I have called the attention of the House, during the discussion of this Bill, to the rule which has been observed in England since the period of the Revolution in every case, with the single exception of the changing of a triennial into a septennial Parliament, which has been justified by those who were parties to it only on the ground that it was to prevent revolution—that it was to prevent conspiracies for bringing back the Stuart dynasty to the throne of England. Now, we have called the attention of the House to the fact that every change of the electorate is regarded, not as an ordinary act of legislation, but as a change of the constitution, and that the nation undertakes to protect itself against the improper conduct of a majority in Parliament for the time being, by requiring that there shall be an expression of the opinion of the country on the subject before it shall be dealt with. This was so in 1831, in the case of the Reform Bill; it was so in the case of Catholic emancipation; it was so in the case of the Bills of 1866 and 1867; it was so in the case of the abolition of Church and State in Ireland; and it was so in the case of the last election, when the proposal to confer the elective franchise on householders in rural districts was submitted to the country. Now, that has not been done in this case. Besides, ther,