

the time 40,000 or 50,000 Chinese had been placed in California the alarm of the American people was awakened. They realised that these people might pour in upon the western slopes of the Rocky Mountains by hundreds of thousands and millions, and that they might subvert the institutions of that country; and it is a significant fact that you can scarcely find a white person on that Pacific slope in California, in Oregon, in Washington Territory, or in British Columbia, who is not opposed to Chinese immigration, who does not look upon the invasion of Mongolians with alarm—as a great evil. It is true that cruelty has been practised in the treatment of the Chinese by the dominant races. That is a matter greatly to be regretted, and which all humane persons do regret. Their rights, under the law, should be carefully observed, should be considered sacred, but it does not follow that the Chinese should be enfranchised. It is a prudential principle among Anglo Saxon communities that foreign races should be taken in only so fast as they can be assimilated; if they are to be allowed to enter the commonwealth faster than the process of assimilation can be carried on, that immigration becomes, not a benefit, but a detriment to the country. We have purchased our own liberties as a race—everything we possess in the shape of liberty and privilege; we have shaped our own institutions as a race; it is our business to maintain these privileges and these institutions, and we can maintain them best by excluding races that we know cannot be assimilated, that will not become citizens, and will not aid us in building up and perpetuating our institutions. For this reason, it is only a salutary precaution to refuse to grant to the Chinese and the Mongolian races the privilege of citizenship and the right to vote; and I agree with the First Minister in the provision he proposes to insert in this measure.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Either I must be very unfortunate in my mode of expression or the hon. gentleman must have a very reprehensible disposition to misunderstand what I say. What I said about British Columbia was, that this Parliament was the proper tribunal before which to bring representations, either for or against the franchise, in any one Province, if there were any peculiar circumstances which would justify one portion of the inhabitants of a certain Province being treated different from the other inhabitants or the inhabitants in another Province. This Parliament is the tribunal before which those circumstances and representations should be brought; and if Parliament were convinced that the representations from the people of any Province were just, Parliament should yield. I said I was convinced that in British Columbia, from what my hon. friend from British Columbia has said, and what I had read of the facts, the Chinese should not be allowed to vote; but I said clearly this was the tribunal before which the case should be brought, and by the decision of this tribunal British Columbia should abide, since that Province had thrown in its lot with the others in this Dominion. If the representatives from British Columbia can convince this Parliament that a portion of the inhabitants of that Province should be treated differently, owing to their being differently situated, from the rest of the inhabitants, then their representations should be admitted and their claim granted. I do not mean to say that they should make out their case in the Local Legislature, but that the members for British Columbia should make their case known here and that we should decide in the matter.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have been trying to find exactly what are the conclusions that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) is trying to arrive at. If I understand him, he says that the members from British Columbia know better than we do their own interests, as to the franchise they require, and that, moreover, although his private opinion is in favor of giving a vote to the Chinese, he is

Mr. CHARLTON.

prepared to yield to the representations of the members for British Columbia.

Mr. LANDRY. If I am convinced they are right.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That argument must be followed to its logical conclusion. If my hon. friend is willing to grant that privilege to British Columbia, why should he not extend it to all the other Provinces, where there are circumstances as peculiar as in British Columbia. For instance, there is the Province of Prince Edward Island. When the time comes, my hon. friend no doubt will be ready to give to the island the franchise it requires and enjoys at present, and no doubt, when the Province of Quebec comes to be considered, he will be willing to allow the peculiar circumstances of that Province to have full weight; and he will do so all the more readily because the same blood flows through his veins as through ours. The position the hon. gentleman takes shows the entire principle of the Bill is wrong. Its principle is uniformity of franchise. What has become of that uniformity? The First Minister says the Indians must have a vote; and he passed to-day such an encomium on the Indians that we felt we never knew before what the Indians were, until we heard what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said, and he depicted the Indian as he truly is. The First Minister was willing to give a vote to the negroes, but not to the Chinese. I think the Chinese are superior to the negroes; not that I would like to give a vote to the Chinese, under present circumstances, but I say, if you want a uniform franchise, it is impossible to have it by this Bill, because this Bill will give a checkered vote, a saltered vote, all over the Dominion. We shall claim, as we have a right to claim, for the Province of Quebec, as Prince Edward Island has a right to claim, the disposition of our own franchise. That is a right all the Provinces should have; and if we establish a precedent in British Columbia, that precedent must be followed in all the other Provinces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot quite understand the argument of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), or the conclusion he has come to. He commenced by stating that each Province should have the making of its own franchise, and I presume that each Province should exercise its own franchise as well at Dominion as at provincial elections. At the same time, he says it is a wise precaution in this Bill to exclude the Chinese. He said that was a wholesome policy; that there were strong reasons for excluding them from the right to vote. Suppose that, for economic reasons, British Columbia desired to introduce the Chinese population, desired to have them as workingmen, laborers and settlers, and in order to encourage this introduction, was prepared to give them a vote. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen opposite, it would be well to give them a vote *quoad* British Columbia, but they have given the strongest reason why we should retain the settlement of the franchise, as regards Dominion interest. They state the Chinese should not have the franchise, that there are moral, political and social reasons against their having a vote, and it is a wise and just precaution that we should exclude them. Of course we ought to exclude them, because if they came in great numbers and settled on the Pacific coast they might control the vote of that whole Province, and they would send Chinese representatives to sit here, who would represent Chinese eccentricities, Chinese immorality, Asiatic principles altogether opposite to our wishes; and, in the even balance of parties, they might enforce those Asiatic principles, those immoralities which he speaks of, the eccentricities which are abhorrent to the Aryan race and Aryan principles, upon this House. That is a convincing reason, and they approve of it. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) spoke very ably, as he does, very instructively as well as amusingly, on this point, but