

know must be disfranchised to a large extent, and that is the miners. In the constitution of the United States there was a disfranchisement of no one. Any person who had a vote in any State retained it in the nation. Said Mr. Wilson :

"It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State Legislature and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislatures."

Is not that equally applicable to us? Trace it through, from beginning to end, and you cannot find a point in it that is not applicable to us. If the slurs of the hon. member for Montreal Centre and the talk about Yankeeism by the hon. member for Lincoln constitute statemanship, then I do not know what it means. The proposition is that many people should have a vote in provincial matters but have nothing to do with national affairs, beyond paying taxes. It resembles the treatment some children receive when told: You can sit at the table when we have no company, but when we have you must stand behind the door and wait. That was not the way the Americans have bound their people to the nation, and the history of the last twenty-five years has shown the wisdom of their action, as there is no nation whose citizens are more attached to their country than are the Americans, not even the English or the German. Would it not be wise on our part to follow their example? Is it not desirable to give our citizens votes, and in no case to deprive them of the power of voting, which they have previously possessed? The American system has withstood severe test. It has stood the test of the country containing millions of bondmen. It has stood the test of receiving an immense body of people who were untrained in the art of civil government. But the foundation was laid broad enough and abiding enough to serve their own people, and all that came to them from across the sea. It served for the homes of hundreds of thousands of Canadians. It served as the home of millions of the race from which the member from Montreal Centre came, and yet the member for Montreal Centre sneers at reference to that nation. I do not think that when the American fathers decided those constitutional matters they were influenced by any questions as to the result of the next election. They were statesmen and patriots in the true sense. Some time ago the *Mail* newspaper remarked editorially that it did not want to hurt anybody's feelings, but "really the Opposition did not count." I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings, but the sneers of the member for Montreal Centre and the "Yankeeism" of the member for Lincoln do not count. We have reason to be thankful for the remarks made by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), and when he came down from his high pinnacle and condescended to discuss the question with this plebeian Opposition we were pleased. Discussing manhood suffrage he said :

"Neither Ontario nor Quebec have for one moment thought of adopting, but which Ontario, at the last session of its Legislature, voted down by a considerable majority."

If no one had thought of it who were the minority. With respect to the Ontario Act, it is practically manhood suffrage with the assessment roll for registration. It is true that the Government stepped just one step short of it. How long they will leave that step untaken I do not know, but I suspect not very long. The hon. member for Montreal Centre goes on to favor us with the character of those not included in this Bill. He says :

"Sir, I can say to those people, and to the people of Canada generally, that if we have not in this Bill what is commonly known as manhood suffrage, we have, at all events, that which gives a vote to everyone who deserves to be called a man in this country."

Those who are left out are not worthy of being called men. He goes on to say :

"Is it possible that you can go lower than the person who earns \$300 in the country and \$400 in the city, per annum? Why, Mr. Chairman,

under the provisions of this Bill every man who contributes in any way, by his wealth, or by his labor, to the good of the country, will be entitled to be registered under this system."

Of course, there was a little mistake there, but probably he did not read the Bill. But why should he read it, when he was simply told that it had to pass, when the decree was registered in caucus, and it was not necessary, even for a legal gentleman, to read the Bill, and therefore he fell into the error of making the qualification \$300 instead of \$400. He says, further :

"We are giving here the vote to every deserving man in the country, to every man who has succeeded in showing, by his industry, his activity and his energy, that he is worthy of being recognised as a man in the eyes of the law of the land."

Who are these men who are not deserving men, who are not worthy of being recognised as men in the eyes of the law. They are all those freeholders in the cities and towns in the Province of Ontario who own property valued between \$200 and \$300, and those in villages and townships who own real property between \$100 and \$150. I am prepared to discontinue my remarks if there is any intention of adjourning.

Mr. BOWELL. Better not cut it in two, because we could not follow you to-morrow.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I am prepared to go on, if hon. gentlemen say so.

An hon. MEMBER. How long will it be?

Mr. FAIRBANK. If the sun gets up before I get down, it will not be my fault.

Mr. BOWELL. So much the worse for the sun, I suppose.

An hon. MEMBER. The sun has further to go than you have.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we had better rise and report progress, and I move accordingly.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the House adjourns I wish to ask the First Minister if there is any further information from General Middleton.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no further information. I suppose the hon. gentleman has seen that the wires are down, but it is believed that they will be put up during the night, and that we will hear to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is stated—I do not know whether on authority or not—that some further regiments have been put under orders to be ready to go to the front. Can the Minister tell us whether that is the case or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot speak exactly, but I believe the Minister of Militia has warned one or two regiments to be ready.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at two o'clock a.m., Tuesday.