

to their white neighbors. In my opinion, the Ontario Act does not differ very materially from the Bill now before us, and on the whole, I think that the Bill is quite as liberal as the former Ontario Act, though the Act lately passed by Ontario extends the franchise a little further. It looks much as if the Ontario Government had this Bill before them and that they wished to go a step further than the Dominion Government were willing to go. I am strongly of opinion that the Dominion Parliament should regulate the franchise for the election of its own members. I heard some hon. members on the Opposition side almost agree that the Dominion Parliament should fix the franchise, if they made it suitable to the different Provinces. Probably there is a great deal of truth in that, and instead of having a uniform franchise we might make a franchise adapted to the different Provinces; but, at any rate, I think it is highly injudicious that the Provinces should regulate the franchise for the election of members to this House. I heard an hon. member the other night state his views very eloquently and clearly, and he seemed to think that the last Ontario Act was a very proper one, where it provides that residence should be a condition to a person voting who has property in different electoral districts. I think there are circumstances where that might act very harshly. Take the case of my own district. There are there a great many absentee proprietors, if you may call them so; that part of the country is divided into two separate districts, and I think it would be very hard that people, who, perhaps during the winter season live in some other part of the country, should not be allowed to record their votes where they have their property; and yet the Ontario Act would not allow them to do so. I think there are some other cases in which this provincial legislation for Dominion purposes would not be very desirable. Take one instance. Clause 19 of this Act provides for a case in which a gentleman was unseated and disqualified by the courts of the country, and yet by a clause of this very election Act, which we are called upon to adopt as a law for the Dominion—by that very Act the decision of the court is overruled. The court declared the gentleman to be unseated, and the Legislature of Ontario steps in and declares that he was legally elected, and shall take his seat in Parliament. It goes so far as to say:

"This Act may be pleaded as a bar and discharge to any petition or action pending or which may be filed or brought against the said gentleman for any matter, cause or thing mentioned in this Act, and shall also be a discharge of any judgment, decree or order for any such penalty as is mentioned in the next preceding section, with any costs in such judgment."

Here, the law of Ontario, which we are called upon to adopt, and which these hon. gentlemen admire so much, upsets a judgment of a court under the law of the land, and declares a gentleman qualified to sit in the Legislature whom the courts have declared not to be qualified. Are we to adopt a law of that kind as the law of the Dominion? If we adopt it in one of its parts we must adopt it in all, and I do not think that is desirable. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell has expressed himself in the most unmeasured terms about the Indians being incapable of exercising the franchise, and in speaking he took a very wide sweep, and referred to the Mexican and South American Republics. It is curious that it did not occur to him, when he was so speaking, that the Indians of that region showed capacity for great development, and that, at the time of the invasion of the Spaniards, they were very far advanced in civilisation; they showed that they were capable of being civilised and capable of self-government; in fact, they were equal to the people who conquered them, except in the use of firearms. If the Indians are not equal to the white man, whose fault is it? I think the white man has a great deal to answer for in connection with the degradation in which the Indians are kept. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says this question should be placed before the electors before any decision is

Mr. DAWSON.

had upon it by this House. We heard the same cry in the winter of 1881-82, when some resolutions were being passed with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway; we were dared to go to the country and see whether the people would sanction those resolutions. The Government went to the country, and what was the result? We all know they were sustained; and I have no doubt, if they went to the country on this Bill, and it was thoroughly understood by the people, they would be in like manner sustained. The hon. member for Bothwell speaks very fluently about an arbitrary Minister and a servile majority. He might apply the same remark to minorities. I think it is not becoming in a member of this House to apply these terms to those on the opposite side of the House. Members on one side, I presume, have their ideas, and are quite as independent as on the one side as on the other side; and for an hon. member to express himself in that manner, in the heat of discussion—I suppose that must account for it—is, to say the least, highly improper. The hon. gentleman went on to compare the present position with that of the Greeks before the battle of Marathon. He went over the whole wide world, and back into remote history. I think there is another battle of much older date than the battle of Marathon, and it is told of in a very philosophic strain, from which even the hon. member for Bothwell might have gained a great deal of knowledge; that is the battle of the frogs and mice. But supposing the Act, instead of including Indians, had said "excluding Indians and Chinamen," what would then have been the course of the Opposition? They would have said to the supporters of the Government: Oh, you are excluding the Indians, who are well qualified to vote; here you are bringing forward an Act which shows that you have no sympathy for the Indians; and those troubles in the North-West have been caused by your want of sympathy for them, and future trouble may arise from the Indians seeing that the Government of this country has declared that they are aliens and has placed them by this Act, in such a position that they cannot exercise the franchise or possess the same rights as white men. That is what we should have heard from the Opposition, if the Indians had been excluded from the operation of the Act; we should have heard loud lamentations about the cruelty of excluding them. I only rose to say a few words on this subject, and I shall no longer detain the House.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) I certainly do not intend to apologise to the House for speaking on this question to-night, although perhaps under different circumstances I might have done so. When I listened to my hon. friend opposite, who hails from Lincoln, I had considerable doubt of the nature of the resolution before the Chair. I remember, on a previous occasion in this debate, we were reminded that it was confined to clause 3, and some of our friends on this side were somewhat summarily called to order when they wandered a little away from that subject. I should like to ask where that hon. gentleman travelled this evening. Why, he gave us the history of legislation in Ontario ever since Confederation. We were treated to the usual stock of extracts, which my hon. friend is so notable for collecting, displaying, as he remarked, the inconsistency of hon. gentlemen on this side, notably the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Tr. w.) These gentlemen are perfectly able to take care of themselves and their constituencies, but I wondered, when he began to discuss the revising barristers section, where it came under clause 3, and concluded he had some how or other widened out very considerably the argument. I should have, at the same time, been very sorry if some one had called the hon. gentleman to order, because it was very pleasant to hear an hon. gentleman on that side rise and express his opinion in any form on this Bill. The hon. the First Minister said this afternoon that representative insti-