

would amount to \$391; and the man who works for \$1.00 a day would, of course, be cut off. Yet, Sir, this is the kind of information that is given to the public. In the *Mail* of a day or two ago, under the heading, "Will They Define It?" the writer, speaking of a member in this House, asks:

"Was he justified in hinting that the people of Ontario would become traitors if Sir John enfranchised more of the workmen of Ontario?"

When the Bill proposes to disfranchise tens of thousands, this leading paper has the cheek to ask a question of that kind. When the gentlemen occupying seats in this House return to their constituents and stand before hundreds and thousands of those who enjoyed the franchise up to this time, but whom this Bill cuts off, or who would enjoy it but for this Bill, if they never blushed before, I think that fact will bring the blush of shame to their cheeks. I have not referred to Prince Edward Island, where every man who pays his road tax is entitled to vote. The member for Montreal Centre provided for that in his own mind. He said:

"I am pleased to find that the hon. gentleman who has just made the sub-amendment is likely to carry it in this House, and that in the Island of Prince Edward the franchise that has existed there for so many years is likely to be maintained."

Fortunate Island! What a pity it is we do not all live on an island! We should all be exempt from this Bill; I could then gladly vote for it. What deep heartrending regrets must have stolen over that member when he heard the statement of the Prime Minister yesterday that he could not consent to that exception. But I suppose he will still support the measure. The member for Montreal Centre closed his remarks with an apology to the Province of Quebec, and stated to them, by way of consolation, that their Local Government would not be interfered with. I hope, Sir, they will make the most of this consolation. I shall now cut the tow line and let the member for Montreal Centre go. Mr. Chairman, how changed is the measure now before us, even though we are only on section 3, from what it was when it came to us. As that beautiful craft came sailing in, we saw a fair spinster and a charming widow standing on the deck; the "heathen Chinese" was in the cabin, and the banded Indian was concealed in the hold. Sir, we have quickly disposed of the ladies; we have kicked them on shore; the "heathen Chinese" we have strangled; the banded Indian we have dragged from his concealment, and those of them that were of no immediate use, we have put on shore, but we will retain those in the old Provinces. We will particularly retain those that may be useful in scalping the member for Bothwell and the member for Brant. We have been surprised, from time to time, at the silence on the Ministerial benches upon these points. I have read in an old volume I was taught to respect, but which is sometimes neglected, the sentence: "Brayeth the wild ass when he hath grass, or loweth the ox when he hath fodder." In view of this silence, one is forced to enquire: Is this Bill so friendless that it has no one to defend it? Is it despised in the House of its friends? In well regulated courts, when a criminal is found to have no one to plead his case, the judge appoints some one to defend him. It would seem to be necessary to do so in this case. In the absence of defence from the Ministerial benches, we are forced to seek it elsewhere; and the next best authority we have is their organs. There are some people who do not read the *Mail*. It is a mistake. There is lots of fun in it; it aids digestion; I have tried it. I will give you an example, taken from a recent number, in defence of this measure. It says, referring to those who oppose the measure:

"They encouraged the dynamitish propagandism in every form. They had friendly words for the Nihilists. They adopted the doctrines of Henry George regarding the confiscation of land. They encouraged disaffected Nova Scotians to rebel. They encouraged British Columbia to secede. They incited the Manitoba settlers to rebel. It is the intention of the Grit party to break up the Confederation if they cannot rule it."

Then the writer proceeds to give advice to the Minister. He expresses some doubts as to whether the Minister will receive it or not; I have more serious doubts than he. He advises a dissolution and proceeds to say:

"We should force through all the necessary measures, sacrificing everything not essential to public business, and drag these Grit traitors and treason-mongers to the foot of the gallows, which the people of Canada would speedily convert into a gallows. That would teach them a lesson in loyalty as understood by the people of Canada, and especially by the people of Ontario."

The writer of that article is only joking. He does not mean to erect a gallows; he is not going into the hanging business. He is not ignorant of the story of Haaman and Mordecai; he is not going to stand the chance of the parties getting mixed at the gallows. He is not going to take the chance of the people enquiring who it is that defend the public treasury and who do not, who invade the people's liberties and who defend them. He asks in the same number: "What will they say at the front?"

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think you are going very far from the question before the House. You are not citing matters relevant to the question.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I understand you, Mr. Chairman, to rule that these articles are not relevant. You and I, Sir, exactly agree. I should have said this article in the *Mail* was not relevant to the question at all, but hon. gentlemen opposite would not have accepted my decision. I hope they will accept that of the Deputy Speaker. I shall, in obedience to your ruling, have nothing more to do with the *Mail* as an authority on this question, and proceed at once to show that from the beginning of this discussion to the present, there has been no attempt whatever to show dissatisfaction with the existing law. There has been no call for a change. The present system has stood the test of eighteen years successfully. From this side of the House the charge has been made and repeated that the object of this measure was to gain political advantage. That charge has not yet been denied. If it be denied, I should like to hear stated the ground of the denial. I believe this change is contrary to the wishes of the people. If you would eliminate from the question all consideration of party advantage, I do not believe one man out of a hundred in the whole Dominion will approve of it. Let us apply to it the test, whether it comes under that class of subjects with which the Dominion can deal better than the Provinces, because in the Confederation that rule should hold. Those things the Provinces can do best should be reserved to them to attend to. We have in the Dominion serious disadvantages to deal with, vastly greater than those the American States had to contend against. They were a compact succession of Provinces along the Atlantic coast, closely connected, not even a mountain range separating them, while our territory stretches from ocean to ocean with long gaps of "unbroken desolation intervening." Under any circumstances Canada is a difficult country to govern, and these geographical difficulties which cannot be overcome, add immensely to the difficulty. Each Province has its local history, its local prejudices, its local business and interests. It is exceedingly difficult to weld them into uniformity. It tends to block the advance of views in relation to the franchise, and will anyone contend that the disposition to extend the franchise is not growing? Any one who has examined the Ontario franchise must come to the conclusion that it is manhood suffrage, with the assessment roll as a registration. In fact, the opposition to it was based on the ground that it did not go far enough, and that opposition came from those who entertain the political views to hon. gentlemen opposite. If this Bill passes in its present form, and is enforced as it is possible to enforce it, it will cause a loss of a class of citizens to Canada that we do