

the desire of the red skins: I have not visited very much in the North-West, or even in Ontario. I have known, however, some Indians in the Province of Quebec, who had the right to vote, and who exercised it very intelligently. I know that the Indians of Lorette are voters. I know that some years ago Indians of a county near Montreal, Laprairie, possessed the right to vote, and I am perfectly satisfied they exercised it wisely and, perhaps, in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, they exercised it too wisely.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I desire to refer briefly to some remarks made by one or two hon. members, because I know that sufficient has been said on previous occasions as to the merits of this question. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island stated that no arguments had been used in favor of this proposition of the leader of the Government. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has not heard this question discussed for a number of years in this Parliament, and reasons given why such privileges should not be granted to the Chinese population of British Columbia. He also declared he was opposed to that Province dictating to the Dominion as to who should vote and who should not vote. I wish to inform that hon. gentleman, if he is not aware of it, that this is not a question for British Columbia alone, but for almost the entire Dominion—especially the Province of Ontario. There is scarcely a constituency that has not spoken upon this question. If we refer to the number of petitions sent to this Parliament last year and this year, I think they will conclusively prove the feeling of the people of the Dominion on this question. The hon. member for Charlotte, N.B. (Mr. Gillmor), referred to statements which had been made as having been exaggerated statements, and I suppose he referred to some members from British Columbia. I wish to remind that hon. gentleman that so far as I am concerned he will fail to find in the *Hansard* any exaggerated statement made by me on this question. Any statement I have made I am prepared to stand by, and to prove it, if necessary. The hon. member also referred to the number of Chinese sent to the penitentiary as being less numerous than the white people. That is no criterion whatever as to the crimes committed. It is well known, and it has been stated in this House frequently, that it is impossible, on account of the secret societies that exist among Chinese, for the purpose of frustrating the ends of justice, to convict them, in many cases, of crime. So the statistics with respect to the penitentiary are no evidence whatever as to the number of crimes committed by that class of the population. They are a very dangerous element to be allowed to possess the franchise. I remember very well when the Chinese, in the city of Victoria, had the privilege of voting at the municipal election, and I remember, on one occasion especially, when a certain individual was running for the position of mayor—a person of not very good character. All this person had to do was to go to the Chinese merchants, who had control of those Chinese laborers, and contribute a little to them, and secure the whole vote; and the result was that those people were brought to the polls like flocks of sheep. From that time the people became alarmed, and I am happy to say that the Legislature of the Province passed a law prohibiting the Chinese from voting, and from that day to the present they have not been allowed the franchise. I shall refer to some remarks of the Secretary of State when the Bill comes before the House.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

On paragraph 6, "farm,"

Mr. MILLS. I ask the attention of the First Minister to this clause for a moment. Twenty acres is the limit of a farm in this definition, but we know that in the Province of Quebec they do not measure by acres at all, an *arpent* being something less than an acre. I also ask his attention to

the fact that this definition has obviously been framed when the farmer's son was the only son of an owner to whom a vote was given. If the hon. gentleman looks at the 8th sub-section of section 4, he will see that the vote is also given to the son of the owner of any other property, so that the son of anyone holding nineteen acres would be entitled to vote, not as the son of a farmer, but as the son of an owner. This definition had its origin in a different state of the law, when a farmer's son was the only son to whom a vote was given. But under this Bill this portion of the definition might be struck out altogether, and a general provision made as to the sons of owners.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for his suggestion as to the word *arpent*, in order to bring in farmers' sons in the Province of Quebec. As to the other suggestion, I might say that, on referring to the Ontario Act, I find that twenty acres is the limit fixed there.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have no doubt in the Ontario Act it is limited to twenty acres, but I think that limit is not correct. You will find, in the neighborhood of towns and cities, many farms of less than twenty acres, the owners of which live in comfortable houses and are in fairly good circumstances, doing farm work or conducting market gardens. I suppose, that the sons of these men could not vote under this limit, and if the hon. gentleman would reduce that limit he would meet a great many such cases.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see why there should be this definition. So long as the franchise was a farmer's son franchise, as distinct from the son of any other land owner, there was a necessity of defining what a farm is, in order to give the farmer's son a vote. But when you give the franchise to the sons of land owners generally, why have you a separate definition for the sons of those particular land owners—the farmers. You give the franchise to the sons of owners, provided the value is up to the qualification, whether the property is a farm, a house, or a market garden, and why then complicate the Bill by a definition of farm or farmer's son.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It must be a limit of twenty acres, in the case of a farm, but there is to be no such limit in town property.

Mr. BLAKE. It must be twenty acres for a farmer's son, but if the farm is really a market garden, near a town or village, which may be worth far more than a farm of 100 acres, and produce more, his son is to be excluded. The son of a mechanic, who has a \$600 house in a village, is to have a vote, or two sons are to have votes, while the son of an owner of a market garden of fifteen or nineteen acres, which is worth probably ten times as much, is to be excluded from the vote.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In the neighborhood of Quebec there are a number of small farmers, especially in the villages along the Beauport road, who live on small plots of ground from which they derive large profits. But under this clause many of them would be deprived of the right to vote.

Mr. BLAKE. In the 8th section the qualification is given:

"Is a son of any owner of real property in such electoral district, other than a farm."

Now if the real property consists of nineteen acres, and has the value, the son will have a vote, and surely you will not deprive him of a vote because the nineteen acres happen to be farm, instead of waste or uncultivated land, upon which you give him a vote.

Mr. MILLS. It is clear that that would be the effect of the clause, though I have no doubt that it was not the intention. In the first instance we find that farmers' sons were