THE TORONTO WORLD.

SATURDAY MORNING, JUNE 6, 1885.

**More Friendly Relations.**

That is what they have agreed to call it. London papers, which we may be sure are speaking by the card this time, give us to understand that "more friendly relations" will now obtain between our two great railways. The Times says:—We are in a position to state that more friendly relations have been established between the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific railway companies, on a footing that does not infringe the clause in the Canadian Pacific's act, prohibiting amalgamation of the companies, to which we referred on Saturday. This agreement, which has been made by the respective managers, provides for an equitable division of traffic in which the two lines are interested. The rates which form the basis of the arrangement have been worked out both for local and through European traffic with a view to the interests of both companies. It will, no doubt, be satisfactory to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk company to find that at length the management have realized the necessity of adopting a more conciliatory policy towards their powerful Canadian competitor. It is confidently believed that this change is the commencement of a brighter era for two undertakings in which a large amount of British capital has been embarked. What the Economist says on the subject is to the same effect.

We do not hesitate to say it out plain, as indeed we have said it before, that it is for the country's good to stop the needless waste of railway war. It is not *war* that is wanted, but merely healthy competition. In time to come, when public opinion is more enlightened than at present, the right and the duty of the commonwealth, both to put down railway wars and to protect the public will be fully recognized, and acted upon, too.

**English Gold Wins.**

The news contained in a Globe special cable of yesterday's date is highly important, if true. It is not said that Turkey rejected Russia's proposals for an alliance. From the beginning of the Anglo-Russian difficulty Russia has been making strenuous efforts to secure at least the friendly neutrality of Turkey. Russian anxiety on this subject was so intense that Nelidoff was empowered to offer, and did offer, the cancellation of the indemnity which Turkey was ordered by the Berlin congress of 1878 to pay to Russia in consequence of the Turco-Russian war. The Russian proposal it is now known also had the powerful support of Bismarck, and for a time it seemed as though their success was certain. All this time England was making counter-proposals to the sultan and using the Soudan as a bait. The bait was offered on a golden hook, for it was understood that if Turkish troops were sent to garrison Suakim and other points in the Soudan, their expenses would be paid by England, either directly or by making up a new Turkish loan, which amounts to very much the same thing. The porte wavered for a long time. A receipt in full for indemnity due Russia had a very tempting look, but then that debt had been so long overdue that it had ceased to trouble the conscience of the sultan, and on the other hand England offered her an accession of territory, rehabilitation of his power in the eyes of the Moslem world, and above all ready cash. In the end British influence and British gold won the day, and the proposals of Earl Granville were accepted just one week ago. These facts have not yet been officially announced, for the reason that parliament was not in session when the bargain was concluded. This looks like "a big thing" for Mr. Gladstone and Earl Granville.

**Sir Leonard's Success.**

In spite of all the Globe's dismal prophecies, Sir Leonard Tilley is meeting with remarkable success in his loan negotiations in London. If the doctors only do half as well for him as the financiers, he ought to return home feeling ten years younger. All Canadians will rejoice at the news, except those of whom it may be said that they are the friends of every country but their own. We fully expect the Globe to prove next week, by figures, that the minister of finance cannot effect any loan at all.

This morning we publish in full the speech of the member for West Toronto on the franchise bill. It is scarcely to be expected that all the readers of an independent paper like The World will agree with every one of the points made, but the speech was an able effort that will well repay perusal, and that cannot fail to attract attention.

The general assembly of the Presbyterian church in Canada will open its sessions in the Crescent street church, Montreal, next Tuesday evening at 7.30 o'clock. The retiring moderator, Dr. McLaren of Toronto, will preach, and constitute the court. Then will come the election of the new moderator and his inaugural address. The Witness says that the official mantle will, in all probability, fall this year upon the shoulders of the Rev. Principal McKnight, D.D., of Halifax, who has been nominated for the office by the college ex-moderators.

---

BOTHWELL, 11th May, 1885.

DAVID DEXTER, ESQ.,
Managing Director,
Federal Life Assurance Co.,
Hamilton, Ont.

*Dear Sir:*

In acknowledging receipt of the Company's cheque for ten thousand ($10,000) dollars in payment of the amount insured under Policy No. 1163 on the life of the late Daniel McCraney, Esq., of Toronto, I desire to thank you for the very prompt manner in which settlement has been made immediately after acceptance of proofs by your directors and without any deduction or discount for the time unexpired before maturity of the claim.

Your course in the settlement of losses as well as your system of doing business must commend the Company to the favor of the public.

I am, dear sir,
Yours truly,
W. R. HICKEY,
Solicitor for Mrs. McCraney.

## THE FRANCHISE BILL.

**The Member for West Toronto's Speech on the Question.**

*From the Hansard.*

Mr. Beaty—I was going to say that if the government should be charged with anything in connection with this matter, it should be that they have neglected so long to bring in this measure and press it into law. Seventeen years have elapsed since confederation was established, and this, the last measure necessary to complete confederation, so to speak, has not yet been enacted. There is no doubt whatever that it is a primary idea of constitutional liberty in free countries that parliament should regulate the qualifications of those who elect their representatives; and in this country, under our system, the superior power should regulate that matter, and not the inferior power. The confederation act was received from the imperial parliament, with the consent, of course, of the provinces and of the dominion; and that act distinctly provides that it is not denied, but it has been admitted through this debate by both sides—that this parliament has the constitutional right to regulate the franchise and to fix the qualifications of voters. Now, for the last two or three weeks we have heard all kinds of subjects discussed in connection with this matter. Not since I have been in parliament have I heard so many subjects discussed in reference to one. This bill has been described as a bill to strangle the liberal party, as a bill to choke them off, as a bill to keep the tory party in power, as a bill to deprive the provinces of the rights they possess, as a bill to deprive the electors of their rights. We have had indictment after indictment and count after count made against this bill in the strongest language that it was possible to use without exceeding parliamentary propriety, and in some instances, I think, exceeding it very largely. I have noted down occasionally as I heard them a few of the epithets used by hon gentlemen opposite to characterize this bill, which I will read. It has been described as an outrageous bill, an infamous bill, a fraud, nefarious, iniquitous, cowardly, monstrous, unfair, unjust, dishonest, disgraceful. There were a great many more, but these are all I recollect. Now, I think this is not the way to discuss questions of so much importance as hon. gentlemen, in their inflamed speeches, would have us believe. A question of this importance to the country should be discussed in a calmer more reasonable manner, and with a view both to enlighten the house and the country in reference to it, and during the few moments I purpose occupying in the resolution concerning Ontario, I wish to bring back the discussion to the real question so far as I can. For the purpose of doing this I will, with the permission of the committee, read just two sections from the confederation act and from the act of 1874, relating to elections, which is now in force. The 41st section of the confederation act says:

"Until the parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union, relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely—the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the house of assembly or legislative assembly in the several provinces, the voters, at elections of such members, the return of writs of election, the assembling officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of contested elections and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating seats of members, and the execution of new writs, in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution, shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the house of commons for the same several provinces."

Then, a large part of that was repealed by the act of 1873, which was again repealed by the act of 1874, the 133rd section of which makes this provision:

"The act passed by the parliament of Canada in the thirty-sixth year of her majesty's reign, intituled: 'An act to make temporary provision for the election of members to serve in the house of commons,' is hereby repealed, except only as to the elections held, rights acquired or liabilities incurred under the enactments of the said act; and no enactment or provision contained in any act of the legislature of the late province of Canada, or any of the provinces now composing the dominion of Canada, respecting the elections of members of the elective house of the legislature of any such province, shall apply to any election of a member or members of the house of commons, held after the passing of this act, except only such enactment and provisions as may be in force in such province at the time of such last mentioned election, relating to the qualification of electors and the formation of voters' lists, and which will apply, for like purposes, to the election of members of the house of commons, as provided in this act."

Now, the point to which I wish to call attention is this: The confederation act gives authority to this parliament to be elected, until this parliament should otherwise order, on the basis of the qualifications existing in the different provinces. That provision was largely repealed in 1873, but the act of 1873 having been itself repealed, I will not now do more than allude to it; but the act of 1874, which was passed during the administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Macdonald), took charge of all the items which belonged to the provinces under the act of confederation—all those items constituting the parliamentary system—except the two items, the qualification of voters and the formation of the voters' list. Now, we have heard the claims made here, repeated and reiterated during the last two or three weeks, that the rights of the province were infringed upon by our legislating on this question. If the rights of the province were infringed upon by this franchise bill, what was the kind of legislation enacted in the act of 1874? Did not that interfere with the rights of the province in the same manner and to the same degree as this proposed legislation will? Out of the fourteen items contained in the confederation act in reference to the parliamentary system and elections, every one was taken away by the act of 1874, when hon. gentlemen opposite held the reins of power, except two, the qualification of voters and the making of voters' lists. Hon. gentlemen opposite, therefore, did not recognize the rights of the provinces in reference to this matter. They said this parliament has the power, this parliament exercises the power, and if it exercised it in reference to twelve items out of fourteen, why should it not exercise it in reference to the other two? The contention, therefore, that any of the rights of the provinces were taken away by this bill is simply a contention that has no base to rest on, and that has been ignored by the action of the opposition themselves. It ought to be emphasized, for the benefit of those who may think that, because of the constant assertion of the fact that the provinces have rights in reference to this question that the provinces have no rights whatever in respect to it. If this parliament, and if the English parliament, with the consent of this parliament, have tolerated provincial legislation in this matter for convenience sake, for the sake of expediting the operation of confederation, for the sake of temporary advantages, that is no evidence for deducing the conclusion that the provinces have rights over this matter, this parliament has no power. If this question of legislative or provincial rights has any force whatever, it is simply from the view of expediency. Shall that expedient prevail for a long period than it has already prevailed? That is the only question. I submit it should not; I submit that it has prevailed too long already, and I submit that this parliament should have taken possession of this, as they did of the dozen other items of machinery, and dispose of it, as they did them, long since. Why should there be any cry for provincial rights in this connection? If I were to make any demand in this connection in parliament it would be on behalf of the municipalities. I should go down to the bottom; if any inferior power whatever to parliament has the right to fix the qualifications of voters for members of this house I should go to the municipalities and then to settle for themselves the qualifications of those who should elect members to this house. The argument that it should be given to them is just as forcible, just as expedient and just as valid as the argument that the provinces should have it. There is one great fact which has been already mentioned, and which ought to be urged strongly, that the variety of qualifications which exist in the different provinces is a strong reason why the present system should not be continued. We have in Prince Edward Island, and practically in British Columbia, what is called manhood suffrage; we have in the other provinces largely a property qualification, in some greater, in some less, but all based on the property idea. If this house is to adopt a provincial franchise the question would naturally arise which of these provincial franchises should be adopted. One hon. gentleman would urge the adoption of manhood suffrage, another manhood taxation suffrage, another residence, age and license as the basis of suffrage, and so on; others insisting that there should be a large property qualification, others that it should not be so large, but that it should simply recognise the principle of property, making that the basis of qualification, simply giving the guarantee to the country that the man who votes has at least some interest in the country. A variety of franchises is therefore a reason why this legislation should be uniform, but nobody pretends that it should be made uniform in a mathematical sense. It is simply a practical uniformity, a uniformity of classes; that is to say, the one class in Ontario and the same class in Prince Edward Island shall have the vote on the same qualification. These classes should be made uniform all over the dominion. For the purpose of this question, we should not talk about the provinces as such. We have nothing to do with the provinces here in this connection, and they have nothing to do with us. In the past we have simply adopted the provincial franchises existing in the several provinces for temporary purposes, until this parliament, as the confederation act expresses it, "directed otherwise." This direction otherwise should have come sooner, but it is better late than never. We had better now bring into operation all the measures that the confederation act declared this parliament should legislate upon for the purpose of harmonising the divided provinces and bringing them all into one working whole. It has been urged very strongly, from the view of the province of Ontario, that the conservative party in the local house, under the leadership of Mr. Meredith, voted for manhood suffrage in Ontario, and that therefore the conservative party in this house have no right to adopt another line of qualification. There is no argument whatever in that. If I were in the legislative assembly of Ontario I might say that for the purpose of that house manhood suffrage was the proper franchise to adopt, though I am not disposed to say so. I believe that the proper qualification, as regards our parliament, or the legislatures of the provinces, or the municipalities, is of the first importance; it has the effect of ballasting men, of giving firmness and decision to their judgment, of making them consider what they propose to do, as what they decide will affect their property as well as the property of others. It does not matter how much a man owns. One man may own only $1000 worth and another $100,000 worth, and yet to the one of $1000 worth may be of greater importance than is the $100,000 worth to the other. The other might lose $50,000 of his $100,000, and yet be a comparatively wealthy man, but the one man losing his $1000 would lose all he has. Therefore, the basis being a property qualification, that has an influence upon the mind of the voter, and gives him the motive to vote for his own best interests as a property man, and consequently for the best interests of the country at large. The opposition to this measure should not be based, as it appears to be, on the provincial idea. It is somewhat inexplicable to me that gentlemen elected to this house should have the provincial idea so much on the brain. I have as a strong a conviction as any gentleman in the opposition that we should maintain, not only the rights of this parliament, but the rights of the provincial legislatures, of the municipalities, and of the individual electors; but as a member of this house, representing a constituency for the dominion, and not for a province, I am not a provincial. I am not a man devoted to parish politics or municipal affairs, or one looking solely to individual rights, except as they affect the dominion at large, and, when you look at these things in the general interest, you must take in the individual, the municipality and the province. It is difficult to reason with hon. gentlemen who seem to be possessed of the provincial idea so largely. I do not think we have heard one hon. gentleman speak on the other side during the whole of this three weeks' debate, who has not constantly iterated and reiterated the idea that we are infringing upon provincial rights. We should not look upon it in that light. We have nothing to do with the provinces as such, except to leave them alone. We simply have to maintain the rights of this parliament, of this dominion, which are given to us by the constitution of the country, and to let the provincial and municipal rights alone. The opposition idea is in direct contravention of the spirit which is shown in the enthusiasm of our volunteers in the Northwest. Do they go to fight for a province or a municipality? No; they go to fight for the one flag of the whole country, as we have taught our children to sing, and that is the idea which we ought to cultivate, and this little contest and conflict in the Northwest, the occurrence of which has called forth the spirit which has followed it, I regret, will impress upon the young men of this country, more than all the arguments that can be used in this house, the idea of confederation and of a nationality and a power here in this centre which must be respected and maintained. The opposition idea presented to us in the war of words of the last few weeks is not the spirit which prompted the fathers of confederation, which made the leaders of the government of that day and the leaders of the opposition bury the tomahawk and come together to build up a nationality under this confederation. If they had brought to the consideration of those matters simply the provincial idea or the municipal or parish idea, would there have been any confederation on this continent such as that of which we are so proud? It was because they rose above this provincialism, because they were imbued with national patriotism, that they so united. They possessed a large idea and a broader view, and went to building up a nationality from the Atlantic to the Pacific, which to-day has been cemented in the blood of brave men from almost all the provinces. This is the idea which we should entertain; this is the idea which we should inculcate in this house. We should not let it go forth that we are a combination of provincials. On the other hand we should be a combination of national men, desiring to inculcate a national patriotism, not confined to one province or parish, but extending the whole country over. This national idea which was manifested in this franchise bill has been expressed in our great railway was prompted by the wisest patriotism and the broadest views in relation to the prosperity and greatness of Canada. I do not think there is any opening country, with the history we have, which has the same advantages to offer to its people. Why one would have thought, eighteen years ago, that to-day we should be almost at the completion of a national highway, leading the people from the eastern to the western ends of the dominion, for the purpose of protecting the one flag which covers this country. That national idea which was manifested by the action of the people should not only be confederated in the statute or consolidated by legislation, but should be consolidated and cemented into a community of feeling and interest and in harmony of spirit, the same design which prompted those who first developed the idea in this confederation act should prompt us as a gentleman in this house who five years ago would have prophesied that in four or five months from the passing of this act we would be chanting to the Pacific on a railway without changing cars, eating, drinking and sleeping the whole way if we choose.

Mr. Foster—Not drinking.

Mr. Beaty—Water. The hon. gentleman can put in a stick in it if he likes. This national idea as against the provincial has been manifested in the national policy, which was designed to accomplish the same end. All those views which have manifested themselves in the legislation of this parliament have negatived the provincial idea, have shown that we are getting out of that. It was one of the aims of confederation to lift us above provincialism and place us on a vantage ground of a nationality, and I think it has accomplished that result. One other argument which has been pressed upon us has been that we should get down to the people. What does that mean? According to the opposition argument, it means simply that we should let the people do what they have hitherto done by means of revision, appeals to the county judge, and other processes, to settle the voters lists. But that does not go down to the people in reality so long as you have provincial legislatures to fix the qualifications of the voters; we say that the qualification, as it is fixed by the different provinces, does not go down to the people and get them, in their municipal councils, to establish the qualification. If I were opposed to this house exercising the legitimate power which the confederation act has given to it, the authority with which it has been clothed to fix the qualification of voters to elect members of this house, I should go to the municipalities. What right have the provinces to touch the matter at all? They have no right; they are not recognized in the matter, except as a temporary expedient; and if we go to the people to regulate the matter, we should go to the municipalities and allow the municipal councils to fix the qualification of voters. And yet we do not find hon. gentlemen opposite asking that this should be done. They simply say: Let the provinces settle the matter. Now, suppose the province of Ontario should adopt this bill next session; suppose it should change its mind, as it has done so often, and say: We will adopt this bill, which was submitted to the parliament of Canada in 1885; would hon. gentlemen opposite say then that we should not adopt it? Would they say it was infamous, outrageous, scandalous, and all those other hard words, if Mr. Mowat, the little premier—always vigilant, always watchful for the interests of his province, in the cause of provincial rights; fighting for it, belligerent for it, at every opportunity that presents itself—more so than I think, he ought to be; yet he is vigilant and active for the purpose of maintaining what he claims to be provincial rights. Now, if he should adopt this bill, would hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should not adopt it? No, not one of them. I should judge, from the manner in which they act in this house, would, for a moment, say that the little premier should not adopt that bill. It would then be a good bill; it would then be a righteous bill; it would be going down to the people; it would be the people's bill; and therefore it should be adopted by this house. And yet we have no guarantee, I observe, in this house, the country has no guarantee, that it shall not be adopted by the Ontario legislature, or by the Quebec legislature, or by the legislature of any other province. Members will be elected to this house upon this very basis. Now this bill is designed, as I understand, to give a people's voters' list, and not a party voters' list. Hon. gentlemen opposite make a strong point of this. They say the bill is going to strangle the liberal party, that it is going to destroy the liberal party. Well, if the liberal party can be strangled and destroyed by such a bill it must be a very weak party; it is not as strong as I am accustomed to regard it. I think the liberal party has a strength, as any party may have, if it adopts a rational and reasonable policy; but if the liberal party continues the tardy tactics that we have seen in this house for the last week, the country will become disgusted, as I know it has become disgusted already. Let me illustrate. When I went out of this house to-day, and was going down the street, a laboring man, apparently came up to me. I had no notion who he was, and I suppose he had no notion who I was. He said to me: "How ridiculous that opposition is making itself." "Why," I said, "that is a very mild word to use in reference to the matter. You have not been attending upon parliament or you would use stronger language." Now, that illustrates the feeling that exists all over the country, wherever you go. Of course, there are exceptions among these little coteries of the opposition, where these printed petitions are signed. Hon. members opposite talk about the excitement. Where is the excitement? Is there any excitement in this country? All the excitement there is is in this house, where we have heard these inflammatory speeches, this strong language that has been uttered with all the vehemence possible by hon. gentlemen opposite. But where is the excitement outside? Is there excitement in the streets of this city? This is a city of some intelligence; the people here know something of their rights, and are able to judge of these matters. But I have not seen any excitement. Even the galleries have not been excited very much.

Mr. Mulock—They are not excited now.

Mr. Beaty—I propose to reason with the people, not to declaim, nor to raise disloyal cries. The galleries have been cleared from night to night by the dull eloquence of hon. gentlemen opposite, and so it goes on. We have no excitement on the streets of this city, there are no bayonets fixed, no one proposes to shed blood in reference to this matter; and so it is all over the country. Hon. gentlemen have worked themselves into a sort of frenzy in this matter, and they believe that because their imaginations are heated the people of this country are also excited. On the contrary, they are taking the matter very coolly. Now, I submit that this franchise bill is designed to secure a people's voters' list, as against the idea of a party voters' list; and all possible precautions will be taken to accomplish that end. There is no reason in the world why it should be otherwise. Now, what is the great point of this bill as a people's bill. It enlarges the franchise. "O, no," say hon. gentlemen, "it does not." Now let us consider the matter. If we take the 120,000 people in Prince Edward Island, and the 30,000 white people in British Columbia—in all 150,000 people—where manhood suffrage prevails, out of the 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 in the dominion, does this bill not enlarge the franchise on the whole? Does it not enlarge the franchise in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba? Have we not heard hon. members from each of these provinces distinctly affirming, one after another, that this bill would widen the basis of the franchise in their respective provinces? Now, if that is so, is this not a people's bill? It does not enlarge the franchise merely for the conservative electors, but it enlarges it as well for the liberal electors. There can be no distinction in this respect. It cannot be made a party machine, cannot be made a party instrument, for the purpose of giving votes to tories and taking away votes from liberals. That is impossible, in the nature of things, and will be impossible under the operation of this bill. Hon. gentlemen say that we get the true idea in courts of revision—sometimes it may be absolutely controlled by liberal members, and sometimes by tory members—grit members on the one hand, and tory members on the other. The municipalities are controlled sometimes by tories and sometimes by grits. There is no use in saying they do not do their best. I know they do. In all the counties in which I have been interested, and in the city where I have a substantial interest, I know, how the machinery works, and that both sides try to do their best to make their votes the more numerous. Let them do so, so they can and will do under this bill. But the machinery provided by this bill will be adapted to give the votes to as large a number of persons as it can, and no further authorise and qualify. The point to determine, then, is as to the qualification, and that brings us back to the cause. We do not need to go back to the constitutions of all the nations of the world and bring them here; but we require to look at the qualification mentioned in the clause of the bill. This bill will place classes in each province on the same footing as those in other provinces. That is equality, uniformity, unification. I have been accused of being a revolutionist. So I was; but I am now a confederationist. I propose to carry out the constitution. I do not propose to fight for the provinces against the dominion, or for the dominion against the provinces; but to give the confederation, as a whole, its rights at the present time. If a man leaves Prince Edward Island and removes to Ontario he may feel wronged by the fact that while he was a resident of the island he could vote for a member of parliament, whereas in Ontario he would have no vote. Under this bill a man who has a vote in one province will, on removing to another province, have a vote in that province. That secures uniformity, and tends to nationalize the people everywhere; and it promotes the sentiment of equal rights to all. This bill may produce discontent if it should turn out that it disfranchised people in Prince Edward Island who now have votes. I do not believe that a single man who has a vote to-day will be deprived of his vote by this bill. If it should pass in its present form, when the elections of 1887 come round. The action of parliament should be in the direction of teaching—and all legislation has power to teach the masses—that we are governed not individually in this parliament, but provincially. What province has sent us here? Not one.

Mr. Mills—The constitution says so.

Mr. Beaty—It says that each province shall send a certain number of representatives. That is all; but they come here representing constituencies, representing the people of constituencies, and the idea should be encouraged that the people are represented in this parliament as individual voters, not as houses have thought, eighteen years ago, that to-day we should be almost at the completion of a national highway, leading the people from the eastern to the western ends of the dominion, for the purpose of protecting the one flag which covers this country. That national idea which was manifested by the action of the people should not only be confederated in the statute or consolidated by legislation, but should be consolidated and cemented into a community of feeling and interest and in harmony of spirit, the same design which prompted those who first developed the idea in the confederation act should prompt us as a gentleman in this house who five years ago would have prophesied that in four or five months from the passing of this act we would be chanting to the Pacific on a railway without changing cars, eating, drinking and sleeping the whole way if we choose.

Mr. Foster—Not drinking.

Mr. Beaty—Water. The hon. gentleman can put in a stick in it if he likes. This national idea as against the provincial has been manifested in the national policy, which was designed to accomplish the same end. All those views which have manifested themselves in the legislation of this parliament have negatived the provincial idea, have shown that we are getting out of that. It was one of the aims of confederation to lift us above provincialism and place us on a vantage ground of a nationality, and I think it has accomplished that result. One other argument which has been pressed upon us has been that we should get down to the people. What does that mean? According to the opposition argument, it means simply that we should let the people do what they have hitherto done by means of revision, appeals to the county judge, and other processes, to settle the voters lists. But that does not go down to the people in reality so long as you have provincial legislatures to fix the qualifications of the voters; we say that the qualification, as it is fixed by the different provinces, does not go down to the people and get them, in their municipal councils, to establish the qualification. If I were opposed to this house exercising the legitimate power which the confederation act has given to it, the authority with which it has been clothed to fix the qualification of voters to elect members of this house, I should go to the municipalities. What right have the provinces to touch the matter at all? They have no right; they are not recognized in the matter, except as a temporary expedient; and if we go to the people to regulate the matter, we should go to the municipalities and allow the municipal councils to fix the qualification of voters. And yet we do not find hon. gentlemen opposite asking that this should be done. They simply say: Let the provinces settle the matter. Now, suppose the province of Ontario should adopt this bill next session; suppose it should change its mind, as it has done so often, and say: We will adopt this bill, which was submitted to the parliament of Canada in 1885; would hon. gentlemen opposite say then that we should not adopt it? Would they say it was infamous, outrageous, scandalous, and all those other hard words, if Mr. Mowat, the little premier—always vigilant, always watchful for the interests of his province, in the cause of provincial rights; fighting for it, belligerent for it, at every opportunity that presents itself—more so than I think, he ought to be; yet he is vigilant and active for the purpose of maintaining what he claims to be provincial rights. Now, if he should adopt this bill, would hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should not adopt it? No, not one of them. I should judge, from the manner in which they act in this house, would, for a moment, say that the little premier should not adopt that bill. It would then be a good bill; it would then be a righteous bill; it would be going down to the people; it would be the people's bill; and therefore it should be adopted by this house. And yet we have no guarantee, I observe, in this house, the country has no guarantee, that it shall not be adopted by the Ontario legislature, or by the Quebec legislature, or by the legislature of any other province. Members will be elected to this house upon this very basis. Now this bill is designed, as I understand, to give a people's voters' list, and not a party voters' list. Hon. gentlemen opposite make a strong point of this. They say the bill is going to strangle the liberal party, that it is going to destroy the liberal party. Well, if the liberal party can be strangled and destroyed by such a bill it must be a very weak party; it is not as strong as I am accustomed to regard it. I think the liberal party has a strength, as any party may have, if it adopts a rational and reasonable policy; but if the liberal party continues the tardy tactics that we have seen in this house for the last week, the country will become disgusted, as I know it has become disgusted already. Let me illustrate. When I went out of this house to-day, and was going down the street, a laboring man, apparently came up to me. I had no notion who he was, and I suppose he had no notion who I was. He said to me: "How ridiculous that opposition is making itself." "Why," I said, "that is a very mild word to use in reference to the matter. You have not been attending upon parliament or you would use stronger language." Now, that illustrates the feeling that exists all over the country, wherever you go. Of course, there are exceptions among these little coteries of the opposition, where these printed petitions are signed. Hon. members opposite talk about the excitement. Where is the excitement? Is there any excitement in this country? All the excitement there is is in this house, where we have heard these inflammatory speeches, this strong language that has been uttered with all the vehemence possible by hon. gentlemen opposite. But where is the excitement outside? Is there excitement in the streets of this city? This is a city of some intelligence; the people here know something of their rights, and are able to judge of these matters. But I have not seen any excitement. Even the galleries have not been excited very much.

Mr. Mulock—They are not excited now.

Mr. Beaty—I propose to reason with the people, not to declaim, nor to raise disloyal cries. The galleries have been cleared from night to night by the dull eloquence of hon. gentlemen opposite, and so it goes on. We have no excitement on the streets of this city, there are no bayonets fixed, no one proposes to shed blood in reference to this matter; and so it is all over the country. Hon. gentlemen have worked themselves into a sort of frenzy in this matter, and they believe that because their imaginations are heated the people of this country are also excited. On the contrary, they are taking the matter very coolly. Now, I submit that this franchise bill is designed to secure a people's voters' list, as against the idea of a party voters' list; and all possible precautions will be taken to accomplish that end. There is no reason in the world why it should be otherwise. Now, what is the great point of this bill as a people's bill. It enlarges the franchise. "O, no," say hon. gentlemen, "it does not." Now let us consider the matter. If we take the 120,000 people in Prince Edward Island, and the 30,000 white people in British Columbia—in all 150,000 people—where manhood suffrage prevails, out of the 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 in the dominion, does this bill not enlarge the franchise on the whole? Does it not enlarge the franchise in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba? Have we not heard hon. members from each of these provinces distinctly affirming, one after another, that this bill would widen the basis of the franchise in their respective provinces? Now, if that is so, is this not a people's bill? It does not enlarge the franchise merely for the conservative electors, but it enlarges it as well for the liberal electors. There can be no distinction in this respect. It cannot be made a party machine, cannot be made a party instrument, for the purpose of giving votes to tories and taking away votes from liberals. That is impossible, in the nature of things, and will be impossible under the operation of this bill. When hon. gentlemen say that we get the true idea in courts of revision—sometimes it may be absolutely controlled by liberal members, and sometimes by tory members—grit members on the one hand, and tory members on the other. The municipalities are controlled sometimes by tories and sometimes by grits. There is no use in saying they do not do their best. I know they do. In all the counties in which I have been interested, and in the city where I have a substantial interest, I know, how the machinery works, and that both sides try to do their best to make their votes the more numerous. Let them do so, so they can and will do under this bill. But the machinery provided by this bill will be adapted to give the votes to as large a number of persons as it can, and no further authorise and qualify. The point to determine, then, is as to the qualification, and that brings us back to the cause. We do not need to go back to the constitutions of all the nations of the world and bring them here; but we require to look at the qualification mentioned in the clause of the bill. This bill will place classes in each province on the same footing as those in other provinces. That is equality, uniformity, unification. I have been accused of being a revolutionist. So I was; but I am now a confederationist. I propose to carry out the constitution. I do not propose to fight for the provinces against the dominion, or for the dominion against the provinces; but to give the confederation, as a whole, its rights at the present time. If a man leaves Prince Edward Island and removes to Ontario he may feel wronged by the fact that while he was a resident of the island he could vote for a member of parliament, whereas in Ontario he would have no vote. Under this bill a man who has a vote in one province will, on removing to another province, have a vote in that province. That secures uniformity, and tends to nationalize the people everywhere; and it promotes the sentiment of equal rights to all. This bill may produce discontent if it should turn out that it disfranchised people in Prince Edward Island who now have votes. I do not believe that a single man who has a vote to-day will be deprived of his vote by this bill, if it should pass in its present form, when the elections of 1887 come round. The action of parliament should be in the direction of teaching—and all legislation has power to teach the masses—that we are governed not individually in this parliament, but provincially. What province has sent us here? Not one.

Mr. Mills—The constitution says so.

Mr. Beaty—It says that each province shall send a certain number of representatives. That is all; but they come here representing constituencies, representing the people of constituencies, and the idea should be encouraged that the people are represented in this parliament as individual voters, not as houses or provinces. The idea should be emphasized and impressed that the people are represented in this parliament. That is the view I take in reference to my own position. I do not represent Ontario. What right have I to say I represent Ontario? Ontario has not sent me here or sent any one else here. Ontario has sent ninety-two members.

Mr. Beaty—It has not sent the member for Bothwell.

Mr. Mills—Yes.

Mr. Beaty—Not as a province. The individual constituencies, the individual voters, have sent members to this parliament, and not province of West Toronto, and I think I can say, and I do say it sometimes to my constituents, that I represent one of the most. If not the most intelligent constituency in Canada.

Mr. Landry—We all say that.

Mr. Beaty—If the hon. gentleman is to be taken as a sample of the intelligence of his constituency, I admit it. We have heard of petitions coming up from different parts of the country in regard to this bill. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite this question: Have complaints come up from any of the provinces? If provincial rights have been threatened and endangered by reason of this bill, which was introduced three years ago, where are the protests from the legislatures of the provinces, which have met three times since then? Where are the protests against the invasion of the rights of the provinces? It is for the provinces to say something in regard to this matter. Where is the government or executive council of a province that has said anything in regard to this matter? Not even, since hon. gentlemen opposite have agitated this excitement, and inflamed the country by vehement addresses, has one executive council, which could have met in an hour or two, protested against this bill as an infringement of provincial rights. How can it then be claimed that the provinces are complaining that provincial rights have been destroyed? Where is the claim from any of the seven provinces comprising the confederation that their rights have been invaded and taken away? Hon. gentlemen must answer this question. They must be obliged to say that no executive council, no legislative assembly of any province during the three years in which this bill has been before the house, have protested that their rights were going to be infringed upon and endangered by the action of the government and a majority of the parliament. Dominion representation should be based on dominion legislation. It cannot be denied legally or constitutionally. This bill proposes to carry out that idea. It takes power to the dominion parliament to establish a central authority, and to give to this parliament a dominion representation. This is the true idea. We are sometimes charged on this side as conservatives or tories—as they are pleased to call us—although I do not think I am a tory, in the old sense of the idea.

An hon. member—Oh, yes, you are.

Mr. Beaty—I think I am a conservative liberal.

Some hon. members—No, no.

Mr. Beaty—I think I am just as conservative a liberal as the hon. member for Bothwell, though I do not think I am as revolutionary a liberal as he is.

Mr. Mills—You are supporting a revolutionary measure.

Mr. Beaty—I go back to the confederation act, and I hold that anything which parliament orders strictly within the line of that constitution is not revolutionary. The conservatives do not fear the people; they were always willing to go to the people—always willing to let the people be heard. If there is any idea strong in the minds of our party it is that we do not fear the people, because our motto is to do justice to all and to maintain all the rights of the people. That has been demonstrated since confederation by the length of time since the conservative party have been in power. The people have not been blind. We have no idea of talking to people as if they were dull and stupid, as if they did not understand their own interests, as if they had to be looked after at every stage of our legislation, in a paternal fashion. That is not my idea; I am one of the people myself, and I believe the people are as independent as I am, that they have as strong rights as I possess, that they understand those rights, that they will exercise them, and that if the people's rights are endangered or destroyed the people will turn on those who endangered or destroyed them.

Mr. Mulock—No doubt about that.

Mr. Beaty—But they don't do it. It was said in 1878 that the people's interests and rights were being destroyed and endangered, but the people returned by a large majority the party who did not fear them. In 1882 they returned them again, notwithstanding the loud cries about the tariff, the national railway, and the administration—

An hon. member—And the gerrymander.

Mr. Beaty—And the gerrymander, and all the rest of it. We believe in this great national work. We believe in building up a nation on this continent, on this territory, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, as fertile a territory as is open to the world to-day, we believe that we should give those constitutional rights and liberties in the highest degree which no people enjoy equally with us to-day. That is the idea. The people see that the conservative party and government are with the instincts of the people, that they are in sympathy with them, that they want to carry out the ideas of the people, that they want to lay the foundations of this nation broad and wide, and the people know that the men who will do that are those who belong to the conservative party. Now, I refer to the idea that this resolution does not affect the provinces as such. In 1874 the bill of the hon. gentleman for East York took away, out of the fourteen items of the machinery which constituted electoral representation to this parliament—they took away twelve, leaving only two. Yet the opposition of that time did not raise a howl, such as we hear now, as to the infamy that was perpetrated, or as to taking away or destroying the liberties of the people, or that the provinces would ultimately secede from the confederation. They took away two items out of those which were given to the provinces for the time being as a temporary expedient—taking them away in the effort to build up a national edifice, which the opposition began, and which, I believe, was the only work of a national character which they ever attempted. Now there is one thing in connection with this question which is very strong and conclusive against this idea of provincialism, and that is that the right and power to legislate in this matter is in the dominion parliament. That has not been denied—it is admitted; and that being the case, it is the duty, the obligation imposed on the dominion parliament, to legislate on the subject. While we have the right to the provinces to look upon it as a broad question, covering the destinies of the Anglo-Saxon race and of the people at large who are under the sway of the sceptre of Queen Victoria, the choice of all people in all the colonies as well as those who cluster around the throne in London or in England, it is therefore a national question. The party was elected to present to this country a nationality in this northern part of the continent, which is the nucleus of a people now, and in ten years perhaps with its ten millions, and in a few years more with its twenty millions; and as the United States have progressed in 10 years, until now they have their fifty millions, so we will increase in the same way. It is in that view I regard it as a distinctive empire, that we have been elected here to maintain the unity of the empire; and, when I hear gentlemen talking now in regard to the federation of the empire, I wonder what they mean. Have we not now the unity of the empire? What did we see in the Soudan, when volunteers were called from Australia, England, Ireland and Scotland, from the different parts of the empire, for the defence of the flag? Is that not sufficient to show the unity of the empire? This idea of the federation of the empire must, therefore, have relation to something else than its unity. We are elected here to perfect national system, and national legislation. That is the idea. We have done it in reference to our national policy, in reference to our national highway in reference to our national interests, and we are doing it now with reference to the same ideas and objects, in order to make a nationality, and to bring a qualification to such voters as this parliament deems proper to possess the highest right of a free man, in the exercise of which this country has placed such a trust upon the hand of any hon. gentleman opposite who has been a member of the legal profession for five years, confident that he will do justice, confident that he will act impartially and righteously in the matter.

Mr. Mulock—Would the hon. gentleman, if possible, state any other constitutional government country where this system that he approves of is in force?

Mr. Beaty—I think it is practiced in England. Who are the revising officers selected from in England? Are they not selected from the legal profession?

Mr. Mills—They are selected by the judges. But who appoints ours?

Mr. Beaty—No matter who appoints them, who appoints the judges? Are they not appointed from the party