

elect members for this Parliament as well as for the Local Legislature. They decided not merely that the present franchise should be the electoral qualification for voters at provincial elections, but also for elections to the House of Commons. They knew what the provision of the law of 1874 was. They knew that an extension of the franchise must extend to the House of Commons as well as to the Local Legislature. The people decided that the extension should take place. With respect to the statement of the hon. member for West York, as to 500 voters being disfranchised in his constituency by the Mowat Bill, I am satisfied that not a dozen voters are disfranchised. The principle of that Bill is that there shall be one vote for one man, and that a man shall vote in the constituency where he resides and nowhere else. Why should a man holding \$100,000 worth of property in one constituency have one vote, while a man holding \$10,000 worth of property in ten constituencies should have ten votes. If it is not intended to give representation to wealth, then one vote only should be given to one man, or else a vote should be given for so many dollars worth of property. There is no middle principle. Either you have representation of property, as of a banking institution, or you have representation of persons. A man of ability and influence should exercise those qualifications upon other members of the community and not by having additional votes because he happens to possess half a dozen properties in as many constituencies. Under the old law if a man had ten village lots worth \$200 each, in ten different constituencies, he had ten votes; but if he had \$100,000 worth of property in one constituency he had only one vote. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite have contended that a law containing such anomalies ought to be perpetuated. There is nothing to prevent an amendment being made to the present Ontario law, retaining that system if it were thought that the principle is a wise one. There has been no necessity shown for the Bill now before the House, neither by the first Minister nor by any hon. gentleman opposite. No one has shown that the present law has worked unsatisfactorily, that any wrong has been done under it, that any class of the community has suffered injustice in consequence of it. The hon. gentleman has propounded a measure which is revolutionary in its character, a measure destructive of the principle of Parliamentary Government, a measure which is an act of legislation in the interests of a party and not for the purpose of correcting any defect in our constitutional system. The hon. gentleman first proposed to give certain classes of women votes. He did not, however, undertake to show the necessity of it, or that it was demanded by the women themselves, or as to how many would be enfranchised under it. Take, again, the Indian clause. Here we had a most extraordinary change proposed in our constitutional system, and yet the hon. gentleman did not say a word as to the number of Indians who would be enfranchised, nothing with respect to their intelligence, as to how many could read and write and as to the number who took newspapers. He said nothing to show that those people were demanding the franchise, or that they would be benefited if it were conferred upon them. We know the contrary. It is a proposal to enfranchise a large number of persons who are wards of the State, who are under the hon. gentleman's own personal control, who will be directly influenced by his agents and deputies; and yet there was not a word said to show that those people were demanding the suffrage or that they were qualified to exercise it. All the information which it is usual for a Minister to give under such circumstances was withheld. An attack was made upon the propriety of making property a test of the qualification of a voter; and yet notwithstanding that attack, made for the purpose of defending the proposition to give Indians votes, we find that is the basis of the Bill with respect to all other voters. In my opinion it is im-

Mr. MILLS.

possible to support such a Bill without deliberately intending to change our whole constitutional system. It is impossible to regard those who support such a proposition as other than hostile to our present system of parliamentary Government. There is a motto of the Crown, "God and my right," and that is the motto of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in opposing this monstrous proposition. We propose, Sir, to stand up for the higher law. We propose to stand up in this House for that which is right. We propose to defend the rights and liberties of the people of this country against an attempt to overturn them by the provisions of this Bill. We propose to retain to the people of Canada the right to control the elective franchise for themselves, instead of putting it in the hands of a Minister, who is resolved to keep himself in power no matter what may be the views of the people of this country. Sir, I dare say that the hon. gentlemen who represent the Province of Quebec in this House, will remember the story of François Hertel, the hero of the Long Sault; how he with eighteen others, held at bay several hundred Indians, who had resolved to exterminate the French race on the St. Lawrence. They will remember how that small band of heroes—for they were such, no less than those who fought at Thermopylæ—how they held those savages at bay for weeks together, and by the sacrifice of their lives defended the lives and liberties of the people of Quebec. The question of whether there should be a French system or a French race in Canada was decided at the Long Sault by François Hertel and those who manfully fought with him. We are here to-day in a fight not less significant. We are here to-day in a battle upon which issues quite as important hang. We are here to-day seeking to defend the maintenance of British Government in this country, as against the South American system which the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce. We are here to-day to decide whether the people of this country shall continue to be governed under the British system, or whether they will put their liberties and rights into the hands of an ambitious Minister, to determine in the future as he may think best. That is the issue. We are here as the guardians of the people's rights and liberties. We are here to do our whole duty and nothing but our duty. We are here to inform the people of this country as to the true character of this measure, and I have no doubt as to the conclusion to which they will come. I do not believe they are ready to take sides with the burglar against the bell-man. I do not believe that those who are being warned of the danger which threatens them are indignant with the watchman who tells them of the danger, rather than with the enemy who is seeking to destroy that which they hold dear. Sir, the hon. gentleman told the House this afternoon that he had no one to complain of among the leaders on this side, except myself—that they had all acted quite fairly and legitimately except me. Well, Sir, I was somewhat at a loss to know what egregious offence I had committed. I had said very little on the Bill. I had discussed the propriety of a postponement, I think for about half an hour; I had discussed the importance of an adjournment at, I think, eight or nine o'clock in the morning. What did the hon. gentleman do? If I offended I am quite ready to justify the act. I have done nothing I regret. I have done nothing of which I am satisfied my constituents or the country will complain. I am here to do my duty and my whole duty, and there is nothing the hon. gentleman can say, whether it be offensive or otherwise, which will hinder me in the smallest degree from discharging those duties which I believe my constituents and the country require at my hand. I am satisfied corruption wins not more than honesty, and I have not the slightest fear whether the hon. gentleman will succeed or fail—and I believe he will fail, because he ought to fail, and I believe the country is coming to that conclusion very rapidly—I say whether he succeeds or fails here, I